1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

133 undefined, for while the plain of Pin Ch'uan, beyond the
162 eastern hills, is, as the name suggests, inhabited by immigrant Ssu Ch'uanese, the hills themselves are for the most
[792] part uninhabited. The villages on the lands of the large and famous monastery of Chu Sheng Ssu on Chi Tsu Shan, the highest mountain of the eastern range, which is over 11,000 feet, are inhabited by Min Chia, though the monks themselves are for the most part Chinese from far off provinces, and the place, to complete the ethnographic puzzle, is a centre of pilgrimage for the Tibetans.

To the north of the lake the rich valley of the Erh river, which fills the lake, and the small plain of Erh Yuan—"Source of the Erh"—are both Min Chia country, and though higher than the Ta Li plain, have a milder climate, being sheltered from the strong winds off Ts'ang Shan.
[317] The plain of Erh Yuan, also a minor lake plateau, has numerous hot springs strongly impregnated with sulphur, which is extracted in a primitive manner and sold as a medi-
[197] cine. Northwards yet, beyond a range of 9,000 ft. mountains, the valley of the Yang Pi river and its lake plateau of Chien Ch'uan forms the last important settlement of Min Chia, who, however, speak a dialect of that language which is not easily intelligible to the men of Ta Li. In the short distance of sixty miles which separates the two plateaux, the isolating factors of bad communications and mountains, have effectively divided the peoples of Ta Li and Chien Ch'uan.

361 Although the Min Chia are surrounded by other peoples, Chinese immigrants such as the Ssu Ch'uanese settlers to the east in the plain of Pin Ch'uan, or non-Chinese peoples, such as the Na Khi (or Mo So) in the Li Chiang district to the north, they can hardly be said to be in close contact with these neighbours, since the centres of population in the rich plateaux are separated by wide tracts of almost

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

563 conscious of this factor as marking them off from their
554 neighbours. Language and education, or the lack of it, are
829 the accepted standards for determining the status of the individual. No political discrimination divides the Chinese settler or official from the natives of the land. If a Min Chia is able to read and write Chinese—as many are—then he is eligible for every post that a Chinese could fill, and this applies also to the less civilised tribes of Yunnan. The "Chinese", so called, resident in Ta Li, apart from a few merchants from Ssu Ch'uan who are recent immigrants, are in fact all partly of Min Chia descent.

The only partial exception to this attitude towards race is found in the case of the Moslem population, a historical curiosity, for this community is descended from the mercenary Central Asiatic soldiery used by the Mongol Emperors in their conquest of Yunnan. The Moslems, still keeping to the essential practices of their religion, form a group apart. They speak no language but Chinese or Min Chia, but they neither intermarry with the non-Moslem population, nor partake of hospitality at a non-Moslem table. Once numerous and powerful, their strength was broken after the failure of the great Moslem rebellion in Yunnan in 1874, when many thousands were slaughtered. To day they form a not unprosperous community mainly engaged in trade and transport, although they also own land and breed stock. For the most part they are "Chinese speakers" although four or five villages of Min Chia speaking Moslems are scattered about on the Ta Li plain. These are certainly of mixed race; the progeny of the original soldier settlers and the women of the country. None the less a physical type persists; aquiline features are quite common among the Moslems of Yunnan.

186 The lack of any strong national feeling among the Min
197 Chia has led many travellers to regard them as an absorbed

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

people hardly to be distinguished from the Chinese, and the fact that many Ta Li Min Chia are bi-lingual, or have a store of "market Chinese" has strengthened this impression. It is none the less false. The language itself, though using many Chinese loan words, pronounces them in accordance with definite rules, and in a manner unintelligible to the Chinese, while more than half the vocabulary and the grammar of Min Chia is wholly unlike the Chinese language. As it is not and never has been a written language it has no doubt changed very extensively in the course of centuries, but a critical examination of the vocabulary and grammar shows that three elements originally quite distinct are found in the Min Chia language of to-day. These elements may be classified as :—

(1) A non-Sinitic polysyllabic language which may be called "Old Min Chia".
(2) Monosyllabic words resembling Cantonese, perhaps "old Chinese" loan words.
(3) Chinese loan words, derived from the Yunnanese dialect of Mandarin but which are pronounced in a Min Chia manner according to set rules.

These three elements are used, broadly, for three different categories of words. "Old Min Chia" words for example are confined to simple and primary ideas, the most used verbs, the names of animals, plants and parts of the body, and the prepositions. Many of these Old Min Chia words are polysyllabic, or it would be more accurate to say, appear to be so. As Min Chia has never been written down it is only possible to distinguish between monosyllabic words and polysyllabic by analysing the syllables which compose the latter class. If these syllables are not identifiable as words in themselves, then the word is classed as a polysyllabic word, and where the syllables can be shown to be

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

197 separate words combined to make a compound word, such words are not here classed as truly polysyllabic.

An example will make this distinction clear.

Gudaiji, the Min Chia word for "throat" is a polysyllable, because neither *gu* nor *dai* nor *ji* can be shown in this instance to be separate words in themselves. *Dao-ser-dser-domo*, the long Min Chia word for the "thumb" can, on the other hand, be proved to be a compound word composed of three separate words, *dao*, "big", *ser-dser* a "finger" and *domo* "before", the whole word really meaning "before the big finger"—an interesting proof that the Min Chia word for thumb explicitly recognises the essential value of that little limb, the fact of its apposition to the long finger.

The second large element in the Min Chia language is the class of monosyllabic words faintly resembling their Chinese counterparts, which I have named "Old Chinese Loan Words". The resemblance between this class and Cantonese words of the same meaning is often close, and as it is generally recognised that Cantonese retains many old forms of Chinese pronunciation, it is perhaps not incorrect to attribute this class of Min Chia words to borrowing from Chinese at an early period, when the spoken language of the Chinese in Yunnan was more like modern Cantonese than modern Mandarin.

Many names of animals are found in this class as are also the points of the compass and some verbs, usually of the more abstract type.

In such words as *der*, "east" and *ser* a "rat" the connection with the Chinese forms *tung* and *shu* is slight, but *ber*, "north" *sai* "west" *gai* a "chicken" and *gai* a "bowl", also *ngur* a "cow" and *mer* a "horse" are not far from their Chinese and Cantonese equivalents, as a table of comparison will show.

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

197

Min Chia	*Chinese and Cantonese*		*English*
ber	po		north
sai	hsi	sai	west
gai	chi	gai	chicken
gai		gai	bowl
ngur	niu		cow
mer	ma	ma	horse

The third, and perhaps almost the largest class of Min Chia words are loan words from Yunnanese Mandarin, a slightly variant dialect of the widespread speech of all western and northern China. Such words in Min Chia cover all modern terms, Chinese place names, many of the abstract nouns and verbs, and a large class of common nouns covering many of the objects and utensils of ordinary life.

Though quite easily identified as Chinese in origin such words would not for the most part be understood by a Chinese unacquainted with Min Chia, for loan words are changed and pronounced by the Min Chia in accordance with their own rules. There is no final *n* or *ng* in Min Chia, and these common Chinese terminals are dropped in the loan words. Min Chia has also very few initial *n* words, the *n* being changed to *l* as in many parts of South China. But whereas Chinese words such as *wang* and *nan* are pronounced by the Min Chia simply as *wa* and *la*, those which end in *ing* or *eng* become in Min Chia *iu* and *o*. Thus Nan King is in Min Chia *La Chiu*, unrecognisable to a Chinese, but none the less a Chinese loan term. *Ch'en* becomes *tso*, and *Ch'eng* also. *Sheng Ch'eng* the Chinese colloquial term for the "Provincial Capital" is *So Tso* to the Min Chia.

A short vocabulary of Min Chia words of the three types with their Chinese counterparts will illustrate both the affinities and the wide differences between the two languages.

C

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

THE TOWER OF FIVE GLORIES

OLD MIN CHIA

Min Chia	*Chinese*	*English*
Dilulu	ying	hawk
Digulai	Ch'iao shu	squirrel
Salagai	huang shu	locust
Serdserler	hai tzu	boy
Niepi	Jih, yat	sun
Shier	no separate term	day
Gao	hu, hai	lake or sea
Lao	shang	on
Dso	shang	up
Urdaobai	hou	behind
Boru	hou	after
Gupu	chiao	leg

OLD CHINESE LOAN WORDS

Min Chia	*Chinese*	*English*
Kwa	Kou	Dog
Sur	Shan,	Mountain
Mo	Meng	Dream

YUNNANESE LOAN WORDS

Min Chia	*Chinese*	*English*
Zer do	Chih tao	know
Wai Shieh	Wei hsien	danger
Dsua jia	Chuang chia	crops
Tsu miu	Tsung ming	intelligence
Mier dser	Ming tzu	life
Yao jiu	Yao chin	important
Fa ni	Fa lu	law
Da biu	Tang ping	to enlist as a soldier
Gai bieh	Kai pien	to change

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

It will be observed that Min Chia is much richer than Chinese in prepositions, and that these words are invariably of the "Old Min Chia" type. In Min Chia indeed there are prepositions for all shades of meanings ; on, onto, up, upon; and back, behind, after ; are distinguished as in English, whereas Chinese uses one word for these ideas. On the other hand Min Chia appears to have lacked most of the abstract nouns, and even words for such a common and vital activity as farming, perhaps a proof that in the earliest times the Min Chia were not an agricultural people. The names of most of the domestic animals, except the pig, are also "Old Chinese" and this may suggest that the Min Chia at one time had no other livestock.

Grammatically there are also certain marked differences between Chinese and Min Chia. In Min Chia the adjective may precede or follow the noun, the choice depending on euphony, whereas in Chinese it always comes first. Thus a fat pig and a fat goose in Min Chia are respectively *go dai a der* and *O a der go* and no rule can be framed to cover this usage. The preposition follows the noun, as in Chinese, although this is not necessary to distinguish meaning as in Chinese, because the Min Chia prepositions are differentiated. (*Shan shang*—on the mountain, in Chinese, *Shang shan*, the upper mountain, or to go up the mountain). Unlike the Chinese, the Min Chia put the negative after the noun or verb. *Bai mu*—not going, *hu mu*—not good, whereas in Chinese the reverse would be the case. In Min Chia the pronouns are still declined, there being a nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative case, not found in any other nouns, and non-existent now in Chinese. The Min Chia, of course, even those with Chinese education, are unaware of this fact, since they have no knowledge of grammatical terms, but a study of the usage of the pronoun words makes it clear that declensions exist.

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3

193 Both languages use the device which has been called
197 "numerical adjuncts" or "classifiers" unknown to European tongues, but familiar from the pidgin English expression "one piecee" preceding the noun. In Chinese the most part of the nouns use the classifier *i ke* which pidgin English has translated as "one piecee" but certain others exist also. In Min Chia the variety is extreme. More than sixty separate classifiers are in use (there may be many more) and of these only twelve are used for more than one or two nouns, and the greater number are only applied to a single noun. There are about six in which the application can be strictly covered by a rule, for example all animals have the classifier *a der* which follows the noun, not as in Chinese preceding it. *Mer a der* = a horse, *mer sa der* = three horses. *A ni*, the classifier for human beings is applied not only to the word for man, woman, etc, but also to nouns describing vocations, which is not the colloquial Chinese practice, e.g. *biu a ni* = a soldier. Two exceptions to this rule for animals and humans exist. Bandits are given the classifier *a der* thus ranking them with the animals and insects, and spirits and gods have the human *a ni* classifier. Malignant ghosts *ger* are on the other hand given *a der*, like animals, perhaps a distinction having the same origin as the *hun* and *po*, the spiritual and animal souls of men which the ancient Chinese distinguished.

363 That the Min Chia are therefore a distinct people is established, and as will be shown in subsequent chapters, their social and kinship systems show radical differences from the Chinese, while their religion retains many features unknown to China proper. Nor is there much evidence to connect them at all closely with the neighbouring non-Chinese peoples of Yunnan. The Na Khi or Mo So who border on the Min Chia to the north speak a very different language and their religion and social customs are equally distinct. All

3: Torrance E-4 (no date)1933 AE3 Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

THE BASIC SPIRITUAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE RELIGION OF THE CHIANG.*

T. TORRANCE.

In my research work among the Chiang tribesmen in the N. W. of Szechwan I early came to the conclusions; (1) that they came originally from somewhere in Asia Minor, and (2) that their Old-Testament pattern of religion represented an early patriarchal type, known to the Hebrews before their settlement in the holy land, and followed by them more or less after arrival there. To this opinion we still mainly adhere. Though much more has been learnt in recent years about their customs and ritual nothing has come to light to change this view in any radical sense.

It is known that they speak a language allied to that of the Tibetans, Chiarong and Nosu. The presumption is that they are of one stock. But, nevertheless, they have certain racial characteristics of their own. They are finer in physique and frequently show Semitic features of countenance which these races fail to do. Many of their customs, too, indicate a closer affinity to those of the Hebrews. Even if it be asserted that the Tibetans and Chiarong came also from the West—which we believe—yet, because of these facts, caution is needed before sweepingly including them in the same racial stock as these three races. The Chiang is a sort of a Jew among our West China peoples. You can scarcely hide him even when his blood has been mingled with a strain of Chinese. He has a way with him, an appearance and a religious outlook that marks him out from others around him.

We admit we have been criticised for doubting the classification. But the language test does not always hold. There are many races talking English to-day who cannot be called Anglo-Saxon. Did the Chiang always speak the language they do to-day? He would be bold who asserted they did without sufficient proof of the same. The suspicion is strong that they did not. To-day, as we hear more of their wonderful religion this suspicion may grow stronger than ever.

What then is the nature of the Chiang religion? It is simply that of the olden-time worship in the high-places. We know that this was followed by the nations of Canaan and after their day by

*Lecture delivered to the West China Border Research Society, May 12, 1934.

5:Graham E-5 (1933, 1941)1942 AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3
Ch'iang

Chinese and freely intermarry with them. In many villages only Chinese is now spoken, and only a few of the oldest people understand the Ch'iang language. The Government has opened primary schools where the Chinese language and culture are taught, and in Wei Chow there is a normal school which the brightest Ch'iang students are encouraged to attend. The writer is much pleased at the improvement in the attitude and relations of the Ch'iang towards the Chinese and of the Chinese towards the Ch'iang.

II. Introduction.

I. History. The first references to the Ch'iang people are on the oracle bones. They lived to the west of the Shang dynasty Chinese who made war upon them, took them captives and even offered them as sacrifices to the ancestors of the Shang people. On the oracle bones the upper part of the word meaning Ch'iang is the horns of a sheep or goat, and the lower part is man 羊, meaning people who raise sheep or goats.[1] The Chinese word for Ch'iang today consists of the character for sheep or goats above, and below is the character for man 羌. A small third character is sometimes added 羌, and this character is sometimes abbrevited to a dot. An interesting fact is that while the Ch'iang are all farmers, they depend for a livelihood very much on their flocks of sheep and goats.

There is ample evidence to show that the Ch'iang united with the Chou people in the war that resulted in the overthrow of the Shang dynasty.[2] Later there were wars with the Chinese, and at least some of the Ch'iang migrated westward and to the southwest. At this point let us quote the tradition of the Ch'iang. The writer first heard it from Kou P'in-shan 苟聘三, who mentioned a year and a half as the time of the migration. He has heard it from several Ch'iang people and took it down in this form from Mr. Ch'en Chen-shu, who lives above the village of K'a Gu.

I. Creel, Herrlee Glessner The Birth of China, 1936, p. 213.

II. Li Fan T'in Chih, Book Four, History of the Border Section 2.
邊防誌 卷四 邊防志二
Shih Chi, Book Four, Chou Ben Ci, Part Four.
史記四 周本紀第四
Chung Kuo Min Ch'u Shih, Chapter II, The Ch'iang Race.
中國民族史 第十一章 羌族
Creel, Herrlee Glessner, The Birth of China, 1936, p. 215-6
Legge, James, D. D., The Chinese Classics, Vol. III., Part II., The Book of History, pp. 301-2

The nomads Mewu

do not go beyond Ho-chou, Ning-hou and T'ao-chou to trade, but they do undertake longer journeys to famous places of pilgrimage. Some time in their lives most of them go to Kum-bum, more often to Labrang. Small groups of four or five tent nomads occasionally also go on pilgrimages to the large sacred cities of Inner Tibet, Lhasa and Shigatse. /38/

In the summer of 1936 all the Mewu-Fantzu undertook the two-to-three-days' pilgrimage to Labrang in order to see the Panchan-Lama, the spiritual head of the Lamaists, who happened to be there at the time. Individual tent nomads also accompany lamas and Living Buddhas on journeys into Inner Tibet.

Formal education is unknown among the tent nomads. The lamas alone are educated and versed in purely scholastic Tibetan knowledge. Only those laymen can read who were once lamas themselves, but for some reason laid aside the spiritual garb. All contracts and agreements are verbal.

The language of the tent nomads is the northeast Tibetan dialect of the former Tibetan province of Amdo. Some tent nomads speak a little Chinese, which they learn from Chinese and Mohammedan traders, with whom they do business. In counting and calculating they often use their rosaries; as yet they do not use the Chinese abacus. If they have complicated transactions, they seek help from a lama. They do not use special measuring rods. Cloth is measured in squares, the side of a square being equal to the width of the cloth strip. They have no particular square measure for their pastureland; hills, roads and brooks are their only boundaries. They measure oat fields in terms of a "day's work," i. e. the surface which can be ploughed in one day with one yak. Their unit of weight is the Chinese chin (pound) at 32 /sic/ liang (ounces). They try to approximate the weight determined by Chinese officials in He-tso. Sliding weights are measured with simple Chinese hand-scales and a stone. Capacity measures, like the Chinese tou (bushel), are not used because there are no products traded in this way.

The Mewu-Fantzu have adopted the Chinese calendar. (1) However, they do not themselves buy the Chinese calendar books; the scholarly lamas figure out the Chinese calendar for the people and /39/ post it on the temple gate, so that everyone will know whether

1. as have the Tibetans in general, Cf. Wadell 7), page 451.

2: Rock K-5 (1934-) 1947 AF16 Southwest China
Sino-Tibetan Border AE3

131 For four or five months of the year, Bahang and the Salween valley are absolutely isolated from the rest of the world on account of the snowed-in passes; Swiss Catholic monks from the monastery of St. Bernard in Switzerland have lately crossed the Si La to the Salween in the height of winter.[45] To the north of Bahang are hostile Tibetans, and to the south savage Black Li-su, thus there is no outlet save over the Mekong—Salween divide.

197 212 The Lu-tzu 獠子 have no written language, while the spoken language itself is exceedingly primitive. They call themselves Nu and A-nu[46] (PLATE 188).

[181] 262 273 The Lu-tzu or Nu-tzu are a calm and amicable people; they are poor and their staple food is maize; they brew a sort of beer and also distil a liquor. They drink a great deal, but otherwise their wants are few; a laborer does not earn more than five cents silver a day, and two dollars silver represents riches.

The *Yün-nan T'ung-chih*, ch. 201, p. 8b, states the following about them:

101 "Their name Nu-tzu 怒子 is derived from the fact that they inhabit the Nu-chiang tien 怒江甸. During the reign of Yung-lo of the Ming dynasty (1403–1424), Nu-chiang tien was altered to Lu-chiang Chang-kuan-ssu 瀘江長官司; the tribe lived outside the borders of Wei-hsi, more than 10 days beyond the Nu Chiang, encircling the river.

"In the eighth year of Yung-cheng (1730) they returned to allegiance and became part of Li-chiang and Ho-ch'ing; they obeyed the native transferable officials of the two magistracies who administered the affairs of the Nu-tzu in addition to their own. They are cruel and savage; they use cross-bows

[45] The monks after waiting one and a half years, finally received permission from the Yün-nan Government to build a hospice on the Col of La-tsa 喇扎 in Tibetan La-rtsa. The pass is named after a small village on the eastern bank of the Salween, and is on the Mekong-Salween divide north-west of Wei-hsi; it is only a short distance to the north of the spot where the German travelers, Dr. Brunhuber and Schmitz, were assassinated by Black Li-su on January 5th, 1909.

[46] The *Yün-nan T'i-cheng-chih* states in Vol. 18, fol. 12, that "they inhabit the Salween and their territory connects with K'ang-p'u, Yeh-chih, and A-tun-tzu. The adjoining southern land is Lo-mai-chi 羅麥苴 and borders on Mien-tien [Burma]. They are commonly called wild tribes (Yeh-i 野夷). They wear hemp cloth garments, the men wear trousers and the women skirts, and no shoes. The roofs of their houses are made of bamboo and the walls of braided bamboo. They grow wheat and panicled millet, coarse vegetables, yam, and taro; they eat the flesh of wild animals and use no salt [*Note*: — The latter is merely a Chinese idea, although salt is scarce]. They have neither horses nor mules. Among them are no thieves and objects can be left on the road. They hunt the tiger and leopard. They make bamboo utensils, and weave red designs into their hemp cloth. The Mo-so tribespeople come over 1,000 li to sell objects among them. They are of a timid nature. Their roads are bad and their life full of hardships. The Li-su prey on them and they are unable to retaliate or protect themselves from their attacks. In the eighth year of Yung-cheng (1730) an official was established at Wei-hsi, and when the Lu-tzu heard this, they came in procession to the K'ang-p'u 康普 border and paid tribute with 80 catties of yellow beeswax, 15 lengths [one length is 10 Chinese feet] of hemp cloth, 10 skins of serow [*Capricornis*], and 20 deerskins, and thus made their submission. The tribute-paying was thus established in perpetuity. In return they were given rock salt and the officials were requested not to intimidate or insult them. They were encouraged to sell the Huang-lien 黃連 [the rhizome of a species of *Coptis*] and they took back much salt which they sold, and thus commerce was established among them. They are quick-tempered and quick to kill."

2: Rock K-5 (1934-) 1947 AF16 Southwest China AF16
Sino-Tibetan Border AE3

and Li-chiang. Their dwellings are made of braided grass and are covered with the bark of trees. The hair of the men is dishevelled. They wear short hemp cloth garments and trousers but no shoes. The women wear large copper ear-rings. Their garments are also of hemp cloth. They grow varieties of millet and collect *Huang-lien* for a living. Their disposition is weak [lacking backbone]. They pay no tribute. The majority of them live in caves in the mountains. They wear garments made of the leaves of trees. They eat hair and drink blood. They are like the people of extreme antiquity. The Ch'iu-tzu and Lu-tzu are neighbors, but the former are afraid of the latter and dare not cross their border. The Lu-tzu are akin to the Ch'iu-tzu, yet their language is not the same. In their ear lobes they wear seven heavy wooden ear-rings. Now they understand the ploughing and planting [of crops], and perform the work of the Lu-tzu by whom they are hired."

The Ch'iu-tzu, who call themselves Trun, are in the habit of putting resin from pine trees on the soles of their feet and then rubbing them in the dust. This is often repeated so that the soles of the feet become thickly encrusted and this prevents the penetrating of thorns, etc. The Lo-lo are also in the habit of doing the same thing.

9. ACROSS THE SALWEEN — MEKONG DIVIDE BY ZHI-DZOM LA (PASS)

Up Do-yon lung-pa from Ch'ang-p'u-t'ung. — Returning from Ch'ang-p'u-t'ung to the Do-yon lung-pa we climb its steep slopes through pine forest, then mixed deciduous forest composed of Quercus, Castanopsis, Acer, Tsuga and Picea, winding in and out and finally descending zigzag the slopes which drop off steeply into the narrow valley of the Do-yon lung-pa. At 8,000 feet elevation we enter magnificent wild walnut forest with Quercus (oaks) and Acer (maples), the undergrowth consisting of ferns, nettles, Elatostema, Acanthaceæ, Corylopsis, and Hedychium. Descending to the stream we cross it at 7,800 feet over a shaky log, and enter groves of Alnus trees, which not far beyond give way to dense forest composed of stately walnuts, oaks, etc. Waterfalls descend around us, and on the moss-covered boulders in the stream-bed lovely begonias receive a constant spray.

The trail descends once more to the stream-bed to a camping place at 8,000 feet among tall nettles. From here it leads steeply up again zigzag through dense forest. The undergrowth was slender bamboo, the trees belonged to the genera Betula and Acer, whose place higher up, at 9,000 feet, was taken by huge spruces (Picea) over 100 feet in height with perfectly straight trunks. The trail continues in deciduous forest of many species, several Acer, Araliaceæ, *Rhododendron sinonuttallii*, *Rhododendrun sinogrande*, 35 feet tall, with trunks of one to two feet in diameter, huge leaves and large inflorescences of creamy-white, large flowers with crimson blotches at the base, also fragrant Lauraceæ, etc. The valley widens considerably and on the upper slopes on the western side, at about 12,000 feet elevation, the forests give way to alpine meadows with bare rock outcroppings. In this forest the undergrowth is mainly composed of a species belonging to the family Acanthaceæ, with here and there a clump of cane-brake. The soil supporting this vegetation is a yellow clay. The trees were moss-covered

1 [i.e., the Ch'iu-tzu people — Hinglyst]

Sino-Tibetan Border AE3

Coming from the east the main approach is by either the Tso-so or Ch'ien-so T'u-ssu territory. From the north by way of Ki-bo Shan from Mu-li.

A trail leads also from the mouth of Luë-dzu valley on the Yangtze along the banks of the latter to Chung-tien, but the Zho Chhu or Shu gyi (Wu-liang Ho) must first be crossed near its mouth.

Inkabitants. — The main inhabitants of Yung-ning are the Hli-khin tribe (PLATE 221), a branch of the Na-khi who speak a peculiar dialect only with difficulty understood by the Li-chiang Na-khi, who converse with them in Chinese. Genuine Li-chiang Na-khi have migrated to Yung-ning and one village, Boa-ts'o-gkv near the lamasery, is entirely inhabited by them. Lo-lo from Ssu-ch'uan have settled to the south of Yung-ning, and also lately on Mt. Yo-wa-bu to the south-west, where they have destroyed most of the forest. Chinese live in the upper and best part of Tsui-yi valley and in the rockier lower part Li-su have settled for many generations. There are undoubtedly some Hsi-fan, the original inhabitants of Mu-li, and also a floating population of Tibetans. The people of Yung-ning, that is the Hli-khin tribe, are now mainly adherents of the Yellow Lama Church (Gelug-ba sect), but their original Shaman religion still exists and is practised by the few remaining sorcerers, who are called Nda-pa (PLATE 222). Unlike the Na-khi Dto-mba or priests, they have no written language, and chant everything from memory.

Another sect called Ha-pa, which dates back to Padmasambhava, also practises its witchcraft in Yung-ning. The Ha-pa priests have their own literature, in manuscript form, several centuries old. They make blood sacrifices, mainly offering sheep at their ceremonies, and, similarly to the Dto-mba of the Na-khi, erect peculiar tower-like structures, some of which are called Nya-ta (PLATE 223), to avoid evil, etc. These priests whom the Yung-ning people call Ha-pa, are the genuine sorcerers of the Hsi-fan or Boa of Mu-li who call them Ts'a-mba.

On the banks of the Zho-Chhu dwells another branch of the Na-khi known as Zhĕr-khin.[1] They speak another dialect which is, however, more closely related to that of the Li-chiang Na-khi than to the Yung-ning Hli-khin. The Zhĕr-khin have a written language of their own, that is pictographs. It is similar to the Li-chiang Dto-mba script but is not understood by the latter; some of the symbols are different, and so is the dialect and pronunciation. The Yellow Lama sect and the Ha-pa sect employ the Tibetan script in their books. The ceremonies of the Nda-pa, the original Yung-ning religion, will be described in another volume dealing with the religion

[1] All Na-khi living on river banks in hot valleys, as in the Yangtze and Zho Chhu valleys, are called Zhĕr-khi or Zhĕr-khin by the Li-chiang Na-khi and Yung-ning Mo-so respectively. The word *zhĕr* means to be afraid, and refers to their being afraid to come from their hot valleys to the cold snowy uplands, inhabited by the mountain Na-khi. *Zhĕr-khin* is also an insulting term and any one who is stupid is called a "Zhĕr-zo" — son or child of Zhĕr; the name Zhĕr-dü (Hot land) is given to the hot river valleys. *See:* J. F. ROCK, the Zhĕr-khin tribe and their religious literature in *Monumenta Serica* Vol. III, Fasc. 1, 1939; pp. 171–188.

2: Rock K-5 (1934-) 1947 AF16 Southwest China AF16
Sino-Tibetan Border AE3

Tsui-yi. The glen is short but steep and is called She-lü-lü-t'o, meaning "Iron nuggets steep place," from the fact that iron was once mined here. The elevation of this part of the valley is 9,600 feet. A short distance below the pass, Pa-erh-shao 壩耳勺 [also called Pa-erh-ch'iao], is visible. The little village is situated on a very fertile plain, but has been almost abandoned because of Lo-lo depredations. Beyond the spur south of Pa-erh-shao, and still belonging to Yung-ning, is the hamlet of Pai-chio-pa 白角壩 in Lang-ch'ü T'u-ssu territory. The distance from A-ngu valley to She-lü-lü-t'o is 22.5 li.

The trail descends the narrow glen and leads out into the great valley of Tsui-yi called in Chinese Wa-erh-lo 挖耳羅, where a magnificent view awaits the traveler; the entire Li-chiang snow range, like a huge sleeping dragon, appears on the distant horizon, but the third peak, Ha-ba ndshĕr nv-lv, is hidden by other ranges. Arrived in Tsui-yi valley the trail continues west between fields, in ditches and over rocks thrown there by the farmers. Most of the settlers in the upper part of this valley are sons of Han (Chinese). Any trail passing between fields is always the recipient of all the rocks the peasants can find in their fields. It also serves as irrigation ditch, the water from one terraced field being allowed to overflow on to the trail, to irrigate a field lower down. When the water is not wanted lower down the path becomes the bed of a brook. The valley floor is terraced; in the southern valley wall is a broad amphitheater traversed by three streams which flow into the Tsui-yi Stream. Here are several hamlets collectively called Lö-bü. Beyond Lö-bü the valley narrows and the trail leads along the grass-covered hill-side (*Heteropogon contortus*), with here and there a hamlet of a few houses. Next to Hli-dü, Tsui-yi is by far the richest agricultural, rice-growing area in the Yung-ning territory.

Continuing on the northern valley slopes we come to the hamlet of A-ka-lo, elevation 8,000 feet. The houses are of mud, the roofs of boards weighted down with rocks. The trail follows the narrowing valley to a bridge near the hamlet of Wa-erh-lo, elevation 7,050 feet. Crossing the bridge over the torrent we continue on the southern slopes in the deep, narrow canyon which Tsui-yi has now become. Mile after mile, the entire stream-bed, rocks, water, etc., is a light green, from immense quantities of algae. The trail winds in and out of lateral canyons, is exceedingly narrow and leads several hundred feet above the roaring green torrent.

The Li-su of Ba-ssu-ko hamlet.—After crossing a lateral valley we ascend the mountain-side to a huge rock shelf or broad terrace, at an elevation of 7,050 feet. Here is the Li-su hamlet of Ba-ssu-ko, known in Na-khi as P'ā-dü. The houses are regular pine log cabins, the roofs of pine boards weighted down with rocks. The latter become superfluous at pumpkin season for the entire pumpkin crop is stored on the roofs of the houses (PLATES 234, 235). The Li-su inhabitants when asked whence they had originally come, replied they did not know, except that they had settled in Ba-ssu-ko for many generations. They do, however, still speak their own language besides Hli-dü and Li-chiang Na-khi, as well as Chinese. Over 30 families dwell in this miserable conglomeration of huts, which look as if they had been dumped on a rock pile.

S. Davies G-5 (1894-1900) 1909 AF16 Southwest China AF16
Sino-Tibetan Border AE3

The Shans usually speak of the Buddhist Las as Tai Loi, the non-Buddhist but fairly civilised tribesmen as La, and apply the name Wa to the head-hunters of the independent country. But this rule is not of universal application, for I found the inhabitants of a very civilised village near Mêng-mêng described as Was.

The Las, Was, and the cognate tribe the Palaungs, are no doubt originally of one stock, but are now split up into tribes differing much in degree of civilisation and in dialect. To get to the bottom of their tribal classification it would be necessary to discard the misleading appellations given to them by the Shans and Chinese, and to get from these people themselves their own names for the different tribes, and where the distinction between them lies.

If their language can be depended on as a guide, they belong to what has been named the Mon-Annam family of the Mongolian race, and are connected with the Talaings or Mons of Lower Burma, the Cambodians and the Annamese. This Mon-Annam family was probably the first Mongolian race to inhabit Indo-China, and the largest communities of them, possibly pushed southward by other tribes or possibly attracted by the more fertile plain country, drifted down to Lower Burma, to Cambodia, to Cochin China, to Annam, and to Tong-king where they founded powerful kingdoms.

In their movement towards the sea these people have left a regular trail of cognate tribes behind them. Beginning with the Palaungs in Yün-nan and the Northern Shan States, the line is continued by the Las, Was, and La-was down to the Talaings of Lower Burma, while in an easterly direction the Las continue through Keng Tung till they join with the Kha-mus and La-meits who spread out towards Tong-king and Annam. The Kha-mus of Chien Hkawng, the Stiengs, Mois, and other tribes of the same family carry the line down the Mekong to Cambodia and Cochin China.

Among the Las I came across in Kêng-ma and the neighbouring states, the men's dress was as a rule the universal dark blue of the Chinese and Chinese Shans. The women usually wear skirts striped with red, blue or white, and dark blue jackets ornamented with a little red

23: Benedict
113, 197, 601

AL1 Southeast Asia
Sino-Tibetan Border
Peoples AE3

/For a linguistic reconstruction of the kinship terminology of the Moso, Lisu, Nyi, Ahi, and Lolopho, see AL1 Southeast Asia, 23: Benedict, category 116, pp. 205-235./

SA 121 601 ST 121 601

a phonemic system, in which similar integration appears. The point is not worth elaborating, since the fact that a kinship terminology does constitute a system hardly relieves us of the task of investigating each element of that system, both independently and correlatively.

In any piece of historical reconstruction, linguistic or other, the natural tendency is to make the prototype unduly complex. The writer has often been struck by the complexities shown by hypothetical reconstructed languages as compared with their actual living descendants, as though linguistic evolution always proceeded in the direction of simplification. The number of distinct roots assigned to these reconstructed languages is sometimes of staggering magnitude, and no ingenuity is spared in augmenting this lexicographical harvest. In the present study it would be easy to reconstruct an archaic nomenclature with two or more terms for most relationships, yet such a procedure patently would be futile. It is far better to determine, firstly, which elements are relatively certain, and, secondly, which elements are based largely on "partial equations" and must thus be held in reserve until a basic framework has been set up. Nine roots, eight of which are

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

applied to consanguineal relatives, stand out in our complete Tibeto-Burman series as culled from the foregoing review. These roots constitute the following system:

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
●197

Tibeto-Burman Terms

*p'i gH		*p'u gF
*m M		*p'a F
*ni FSi		*k'u HB
	*mm yOb	
	*s Ch	
		*mk Sl

The forms given above can be accepted with some confidence as fair approximations of the archaic Tibeto-Burman roots. All except the affixal term *mk have vocalic finals, and it was on the basis of finals or "rhymes" (medial vowel + final consonant), especially of vocalic finals, that Shafer and the writer were able to work out the main features of Tibeto-Burman phonology. Earlier writers had in general attacked the problem from the most difficult angle, that of initials and tones. Thus, no less a scholar than Laufer is responsible for the following absurd dictum:

> Prefixes as well as final consonants....are of minor importance in the comperative study of Indo-Chinese languages.... the stuff of comparison remains the initial consonant and the tone conditioned by it. (TP 17, p. 115).

Prefixes have shown to be of basic importance, while both the initials and the tones have been so influenced by the prefixes that our analysis of them still lags far behind our analysis of the finals. In the above set of terms, however, the only problems in re initials concern the aspiration or lack of aspiration, voicing or unvoicing, of the stop initials of *p'i, *p'u, *p'a, and *k'u. Kukish has *pi gV and *pu gF,

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

but initial aspiration is not well preserved in this group. Miktr has p'i gH, p'u gF, hm < *k'u HB, but po < *pa F. Meithei, which ordinarily preserves aspiration, has pu gF, pa F, and hm Fl (< HB). Kachin has hm HF (< ZB) rather than the anticipated *k'u, and Burmese has (sta-)kui oS rather than *k'ui. Tibetan has p'ji gL, p'a F, and k'u FB (< ZB), while both Tibetan and Kachin have p'u oS (< gF). It may be that one or more of these roots had a sonant rather than a surd initial. Initial g-, a rare element in our comparative material, is perhaps indicated for the ZB root (*gu ~ *g'u), but at present nothing definite can be said on this point.

Only one of the above terms is uncertain as regards final, viz. *ni FSi. Classical Tibetan has no rather than *ni, and Meithei has hoa~ no rather than *ni, both of which point to an archaic form *noi rather than *ni. The weight of evidence, however, speaks in favor of the reconstruction *ni, from which *noi may have been developed as a doublet root; cf. Kukish *nau yoh, *nou "young, tender", which tend to be confused (vide pt. 15).

The beside gF terms *p'i and *p'u are found together in Garish, Miktr, Meithei, Bru, Kukish, and Duruish-Lolcish (but p'e^3 gqF < *p'i in Burmese itself, which has a new term [p'u^3] for gE). The root *p'i is further retained in its basic meaning in Tibetan, Mramri (perhaps Tibetan loan-word), Bahing, and Vayu, while Gheng has retained it in the meaning "gF". In northern TS groups the root *p'u has been applied

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

to oB, viz. in Tibetan, Limbu, Newari (only in combination), Digaro, and Kachin. This semantic interchange also appears in Burmish-Lolo1sh, viz. Moso p'u gF, bu oB, Nyi bu gF, [illegible] oB. The interplay of surd and sonant initials in these Moso and Nyi forms indicates that doublets are involved. In Barish the root *p'i gM (in the form bi) has been applied to oSi, both in the Bodo-Dimasa and Garo divisions of this group, and also retained in its basic meaning. It is clear that these usages are connected with the especial position held by oSb, and that the gP terms function here simply as honorifics. Other TB roots, less widely distributed than the above, show the same type of semantic shift (vide infra). In societies with a patrilineal bias it is only natural that the role of oB should be of more significance than that of oSi, thus perhaps accounting for the relative stability of *p'i as compared with *p'u. It can hardly be without significance that in the single matrilineal group encountered (Barish) the term *p'i gM should have been applied to oSi, in contrast to all other TB groups.

Of the two basic P terms *p'a F and *[illegible] M, the former is the most widely distributed and shows fewer variations. The following groups have this root (*p'a): Tibetan, Kanauri, Byangsi, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Miri, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, and Kukish. This root commonly appears as a masculine affix, but no instance of a transference to "oB" has been uncovered. The

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

root *ma M appears in Tibetan, Kanauri, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Barish, and Meithei. In Burmese itself it is retained only in the terms ma' Si and a-ma' "feminine suffix", and in the closely-related Maru only in the meaning "MSi". Nung has preserved this root only in the feminine suffix -ma. A transference to the meaning "oSi" is found in the contiguous North Assam groups Dafla and Aka. In Kachin and the extensive Kukish group this root appears to have vanished without leaving a trace.

The two PSb terms *ni and *k'u are also unequally represented in Tibeto-Burman. The root *ni FSi is of almost universal occurrence. In its basic meaning it appears in Tibetan, Gyarung, Kanauri, Thebor, Vayu, Newari, Abor-Miri, Nung, Burmish-Loloish (but not in Burmese itself), Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, and Kukish. Kachin has retained it only in the affinal meaning "WM". Aka, if we can trust our inadequate sources, has applied this root to M, while Limbu has applied it to oSi. Replacement by the term for "oSi" is seen in Dafla, Sho, Changki (Ao), and probably Kadu, while Mongsen (Ao) shows replacement by the term for "oSb". The Dafla material indicates that this is an analytical development ("oSi of F"). Lepcha equates FSi with WSi in the term nyu ~ nyo, applied to female relatives in the uterine line. This unusual equation also appears in Bahing, which has no-no MSi, FSi (from no < *na M), and po-po FB (from po < *pa F), yet has ku-ku MB. Distinct terms have been

SA developed in Kachin (mui), which preserves *-i as an affixal
601 term (WH), and in Burmese (ri^3), but *-i is retained in the
193 closely related Maru. The Dimasa term da-de FBi (be-de MB)
197 is likewise distinct.
ST
601 The much more restricted root *k'u MB is found in its
193 primary meaning in Bahing, Vayu, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Digaro,
197 Nung, Mikir, and Ao. Tibetan has k'u FB, but skud < *k'u Fl,Bl.
Himalayish and Lepcha also have k'u FB, probably because of
Tibetan influence. Kachin, Maithai, Htenyi Rengma, and Anyo
Rengma have retained the term in the affixal meaning "HF"
(Maithai Fl), and Sema in the affixal meaning "FSiH". Chang
(Konyak) has the form ko MB, which cannot with certainty be
connected with this root. In the Burmish-Lolo1sh group we can
cite only Burmese kui "prefix used with names of persons older
or of higher rank than the speaker, or politely of his equals"
(ats-kui eB), Akha a-kŏ B, Ahi kŏ-pu-li ySiH, and Moso a-gu Bl.
The Moso usage is paralleled in the Barish group, where we
find Bodo gu-mi, Garo gu-ma Bl. This root cannot be traced
in the Naki languages proper, yet can be reconstructed for
Nukish on the basis of the Naga terms (supra), and for Nukic
in general on the basis of the Mikir and Maithai terms.

The root *nau ySb, occasionally applied either to yB or
ySi alone, also to Ch, is well represented in Tibeto-Burman.
It appears in the following groups: Tibetan (nu ~ no), Byangsi
(yB), Limbu, Lepcha, Aka, Kachin, Konyak, Barish (ySi), Maithai,
Maru (yB), and Nukish (ySb ~ Ch). The most conspicuous gaps are
those in Abor-Miri-Dafla, Nung, and Burmish-Lolo1sh.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The eighth and last of the basic consanguineal terms is *wa Ch, which is found in Tsangla, Bugari, Miju, Abu, Kachin, Kadu, Bunu (sa-mi D), Pyu, Burmish-Lolo1sh, Konyak, Barish, Nishi, Naithoi, Mru, and Nukish (rarely used for yBb, as in Poeren and Kyau). Lepcha has a-so < *sa ggF, a-son gCh (with suffixed -n). This root is conspicuously absent in Tibetan and its dialects (but present in Tsangla, a Bodish language), Himalayish, and Kiranti, i.e. the northern or northwestern band of Tibeto-Burman languages, as well as in the Abor-Miri-Dafla group.

The affinal term *mak Sl appears in Tibetan, Lepcha (< *mak), Dhimal (< *mak), Miri, Kachin (da-ma < *de-mak), Burmese (ma-mak), Naithoi, Mru, and Nukish, with an additional uncertain occurrence in Byangsi. In view of our generally inadequate data on affinal nomenclatures (e.g. we do not have the term for "Sl" in Bunu, where we should expect to find this root), the widespread distribution of this root is of increased significance. It would appear that the root is lacking in Himalayish, Nishi, Konyak, and Barish.

The above set of basic terms is supplemented by a series of roots of restricted distribution. Some of these serve mainly as replacements for the basic roots, while others are functionally more independent. Since our set of basic terms is not complete, we must assume that some of these roots represent archaic Tibeto-Burman elements, but this point is best discussed after the various secondary roots have been analyzed.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The gF roots *p'i gH and *p'u gF have no serious rivals in Tibeto-Burman. A curious link between Tibetan and Southern Naki is suggested by the following set of terms: Tib. po ~ spo gF (literary or dialectical), rmo gH (literary), and Sho a-pŏ ~ a-pŏk gF, Chinbon kə-mo gH, Yindu kə-mo gF. A possible root *si is indicated by Balti as-si (= a-si) ggH, Rung a-si gH, Khami a-um-si gF, and Kadu a-si HSi (i-si "woman"), Yindu kə-si FSi, Sho a-si FSi,oSi (cf. the roots *ta and *tei, infra). In general, gF terms show more variation than do F terms; thus, Kachin has developed distinct terms for both gH (woi) and gF (ji), and note forms such as Byangsi ti-ti gF, Bahing and Vayu ki-ki gF.

The most conspicuous of the secondary F roots is *nu H, which appears in Kachin, Miju, Sak, Konyak, Nukish, and perhaps Nikir and Meithei (in combination). The root *pui "mother, female" is restricted to Nikir and Nukish. The Nukish feminine affix *la, used especially of young females, seems to have given rise to Mongsen-Changki (Ao) a-la H, Ntenyi Rengma a-la ggH, Anyo Rengma a-la gH, and cf. Byangsi la-la gH, Sunwari a-la Si. The same root (*la) appears in Kachin, Burmish-Loloish, and elsewhere as a masculine affix. The Tibeto-Burman root *wa "male" serves to explain both Bunan and Kachin wa, Kadu a-wa, Garo (dialects of A type) a-wa F (Mosheng and Rangsang wa F probably through Kachin influence), Aka au < *a-wa F, Burmese wa-kri[3] "term of address to old man" (Arakanese dialect), and Lepcha a-vo < *wa, Meithei (ma-)wa, Nukish wa H; cf. also Digaro ma-wa "male",

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Khimsi -ma "masculine suffix", Bodo hama "male". Some of these forms, however, may have resulted from a phonetic development from *p'a F (probably via *ba).

A root *mai or *ma appears sporadically in Tibeto-Burman, sometimes with a dental suffix. This root is parallel to, but distinct from, TB *ma M. The following forms belong here: Tibetan -med "woman" (in bud-med < *bu-med, paralleling bu-rgyud), Gyarung te-mi ~ te-me "corpse", Kanauri -med (suffix in "D" and "Ml"), Chambu Lahuli me "bitch", Limbu met W, Lepcha a-mit "woman", Kuki a-me M, Mung a-me M (cf. Mung a-p'e F), Burmese a-mi[3] ~ a-me M, and Garo me-cik "woman, wife". Note also the series formed by Burmese za-mi[3], Ahu za-mi, Mung za-mi D (from *ma Ch). Garo ga-me Bl, Mikir me SiH correspond phonetically but can scarcely be fitted in otherwise.

In addition to the above, there are traces of a set of roots *ya and *yu, both applied to female relatives. The former is better attested than the latter; cf. Himalayish (Manchati, Kanashi, Chambu Lahuli) ya M, Abor-Miri and Dafla yo < *ya gM (but in Pagri Miri used for "M" in address), Tshilong (Konyak group) ya M, Naga *ya M, also Kanauri yas, Rai (Kiranti) ma-ya, Burmese ma-ya[3] W, Digaro ni-ya "woman", ka-ni-ya W. The root *yu is represented only by Kanauri yu-med, Khambu (Kiranti) yuh, Lepcha a-yu W, Lepcha tA-yu "woman", and perhaps Tibetan yu-ma "female of a stag".

Nothing has yet been said of oSb terms, which show a wide variety of forms contrasting with the standard ySb root (*mau

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Much of the material in this comparison is of a scattered nature from which it is difficult to draw any conclusions. Thus, Byangsi bya, Daking ya oH, Maithil ya-an oH, Chauto (Old Kuki) a-ya H, ai-ya oHi, and Khami ya-at ~ ya-i oH suggest an archaic root *ya oH, yet this same element appears in another setting (supra). Burmese ste-hni < *tih-hni oH, Mikir ik oB lack cognates elsewhere, as do Maru pai oHi, Chonbok pai oHi(ws), unless the latter pair be connected with Burmese a-pei "mother" and perhaps Mikir pei ~ pe H. The characteristic Kukish root a oHb (Central, Northern, and Old Kuki groups only) does not appear elsewhere in this setting, yet appears to be identical to Sho ê H, Taungthu u W, Pru u H, and Burmese u^{3} MB (restricted to names of men considerably older than the speaker), perhaps also Tanghkhul a-ŏ gF,MB.

Three or four roots, however, stand out more prominently than the above lot and deserve especial consideration. Tibetan a'o oHi(ws) has been compared with Himalayish *a'o "female" as represented by Kanauri a'ets "female, woman", Kanashi a'ets W (with diminutive suffix -ts) and with the Byangsi-Chaudangsi term a'o xC, as well as with Johar a-ee F^{w} The above terms all point to a TB root *a'ai. A similar root, but apparently with unaspirated initial (*gai), is represented by Konyak jei ~ cei oHb ~ oH, Maithil ae oHi, Tanghkhul cei oHb, Western Kuki *cei oHb, Angu Rangma a-ee oHb. The Tibetan term appears to be etymologically connected with the word a'a-ba "great", from which the respectful term gaan-po oB has been developed.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

A root *ma sNi appears in Maruri, Vayu, Kachin, Andro, and Konyak, while the Aiguru and Abor-Miri-Dafla groups have *ma N, and Lalbur has the vocative term i-ma N. Tibetan mna D1 perhaps also belongs here, though it may be of periphrastic origin (< mna "oath").

The Tibeto-Burman root *ta (often in the form da) is consistently applied to relatives older than Ego, if one regards the Bahing-Vayu root *ta CN as of distinct origin. The following terms can be grouped with this root: Tibetan 'a-ta F (dialectical), oB (Eastern Tibet), Tsangla a-ta oB, Gyarung a-da-ta F, Jakar a-ta oBi, Byangsi ta-ta oBi, Newari ta-to oBi, Miri and Dafla a-to < *ta gF, Digaro ta gF, da oB, Burmese t'a^{3}-t'a^{3} F (dialectical), Akha a-ta F, Independent Lolo a-da F, Sho a-ta oB, Chinhon (ka-)t'a oB, Lhota a-ta oBb, Changki (Ao) a-ta FBi,oBi, Rawang Rangma a-da FoB. Doublet forms are found only in Digaro (ta gF, da oB). Unlike *p'u gF,oB this root has also been applied to F in some languages (Tibetan, Gyarung, Burmese, Akha). Desgodins describes the Tibetan term 'a-ta as a "children's word" (vox puerorum), and in Independent Lolo a distinction is made between a-da F (used by children) and a-bu ~ a-bo F (used by adults).

Kanauri ta-to gF, a-te oB are clearly of a type paralleling that described above. The suggested TB root is *tai, with which can be grouped Byangsi ta-to xC(ss), Dafla tă-tŏ FyB,oB (in different sources), Kadu a-te oBi, Bunpara a-dai oB, Mikir to oBi(ws), Meithei i-tai-ma oBil, and Mru a-dai BM.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

An objection might be raised to the above discussion on the ground that forms such as *na, *ta, and *tsi (te) are of "nursery word" type and should not be regarded as representing actual TB roots. The writer himself originally ascribed to this general point of view, but the collection of material on which this study is based has led him to discard it. Thus, ta F appears both in the West Tibetan dialects (Balti, Purik) and in the nomad dialects of Eastern Tibet, as well as in the aberrant Gyarung language, whence we can safely infer a Bodish root *ta F. The term na oSi appears in five distinct languages representing two different foci (Murmi-Vayu and Kachin-Andro-Konyak), and na N in two isolated groups (Almora and Abor-Miri-Dafla). Distributions of this type are scattered, to be sure, yet not entirely random. The cluster of connotations (gP,P,oSb) around these roots is also not without significance.

The majority of the terms for Sb(ds) are of limited distribution. Tibetan sring-mo Si(ms), dialectically used for ySi, appears also in Himalayish (Si) and Byangsi (ySi), with an additional possible occurrence in Dhimal-Toto (Si). Kachin jan < *jar Si(ms), often used for ySi, is directly related to Kukish *dzar Si(ms), which in Western Kuki is used for ySi, and to Maithoi i-cal ~ i-can ySi, Kadu san, Sengmai cal ysi. Kachin yung B(ws) has been compared with the Garo-Dimasa root *yung yB. The tendency to equate Sb(ds) with ySb is reflected in all three roots.

The roots *nau ySb and *za Ch are of almost universal occurrence and have no serious rivals. The former is

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 conspicuously absent in Burmish-Loloish, which has a root *ayi (ńi), comparable with Lepcha nyi-t'i gCh. A root *nga is suggested by Murmi and Gurung a-nga ySi, Miri ăng-ă ySb, Dafla ang-a Ch, Naga *nga Ch. Isolated roots *a Ch and *ka Ch are represented by Digaro a, Abor-Miri o < a Ch, and Newari ka, Abor-Miri ko < *ka Ch, respectively.

●197 It will be noted that the set of basic terms presented above lacks all collateral terms as well as a gCh term. Our data on collateral terms are incomplete for many groups, so that negative evidence here is of relatively little value, but it would seem that no root or roots for xC have been developed. The only root of any extension here is *ning, which appears in Kachin (xCe,ws), Chang (xC), Mikir BW(ws), and perhaps Garo (Sbl). The Mikir and Garo affinal meanings can be explained in terms of cross-cousin marriage.

Three or perhaps four TB roots show a tendency to equate H with gCh. Tibetan ts'a Ne (probably SiS,ms),gCh furnishes an example of this tendency. Bahing and Newari have this root (*ts'a) in the meaning "gS", but in the Kiranti languages in general it is used for "S" (see the discussion in pt. 4). Kanauri e'ad Sl (with suffixed -d) has been brought into comparison via SiS(ms), equated with Sl under cross-cousin marriage. Kachin ta'a MB,MBS(ws) can be explained only on the basis of a reciprocal development from SiS(ms). Mikir e-sa SiS(ms),Sl shows an ideal agreement on the semantic side, but the comparison is phonetically dubious. The root *ts'a appears to be lacking in other groups.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The roots *su and *tu have distributions which are almost, if not quite, mutually exclusive. *Su gCh appears in Kachin, Bodo, Mikir, and Meithei, while *tu appears in Nung (N), Burmish-Loloish (xN), and Kukish (FSiCh,SiCh,ms,gCh). Anu, a Southern Kuki language, has su xC,ySi(ws),SiCh(ws),gCh, and a-su-lai SiCh(ms), covering much the same ground as Kukish *tu. The roots *su and *tu must be regarded as distinct on general phonetic grounds, and this view is strengthened by the evidence from Meithei, which has i-su gCh as well as (ma-)tu W (cf. the Kuki use of *tu in the meaning "Sl", through cross-cousin marriage). The root *su is perhaps also represented in the Naga languages, in much the same setting as Anu su, viz. Angami cu ~ tsu FSiS,ySiS(ms),gS, Nzong Rengma a-cu-gŭ, Ntenyi Rengma a-zu-wa, Anyo Rengma a-zŭ FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh, but our knowledge of Naga phonology is not sufficiently advanced to establish this comparison.

A fourth root of the same general type is *ma-li, which is found in Nung (gCh), Burmish-Loloish (gCh), Pyu (gCh), Chang (xN), Garo (SiS,ms), Mikir (xN, probably BCh,ws), and has an additional cognate in Kachin (ma-li "young man"). This root is in general lacking in Kukish, but may be represented by Taungtha lwi Ne,Ni and Yindu (ka-)li BD(ws). It cannot be traced in Tibetan or any of the northern languages.

The affinal root corresponding to *mak Sl is perhaps *nam Dl, but the evidence for the latter root is not altogether satisfactory. Lepcha has nyom < *snam Dl paralleling myok < *smak Sl, and s- prefixed forms are also represented by

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Kanauri stem < *snom (probably for snăm) Dl, and Barish *snam Dl (based on Dimasa ba-ham, Garo nam). Cf. also Gyarung snom < *snam Si, Burmese hnam < *snam ySi(ms) (inferred from mong-hnam "H and W", where mong means "yB,wa"), Lashi tu-nam Dl, nam-mo ySi(ms), Nyi nŏ-mo < *nam-mo ySi(ms), and Lushei hnăm < *snăm "clan". The unprefixed form appears in Byangsi nam-sia Dl, Kachin nam Dl,ySil, and Nung nam Sb, while Lepcha has both nyom < *snam Dl and nom < *nam oSi. Magari ar-năm "girl" also belongs in this series.

Of more restricted distribution are the roots *mou Dl, represented by Kukish mou (Lushei mo), Meithei i-mau, and perhaps Tibetan mo "woman", and *k'rwi Sl, represented by Kachin k'ri Sl,SiCh(ms), Burmese k'rwe^{3}-ma^{1} < *k'rwi^{3}-ma^{1}, Lisu c'i-ma Dl (with feminine suffix -ma), and perhaps Lepcha tă-gri "male". The original meanings of these roots may have been simply "female" and "male", respectively.

There remain for consideration a few poorly represented roots connected primarily with the PSb nomenclature. Nung a-tsim MSi is comparable with Tsangla a-tim, id., and Nung a-wang FB with Garo a-wang FyB, also Lashi vang-mo HF,FoSiH, Maru vung ~ vun HF,FSiH (but the Lashi and Maru terms suggest a meaning "MB" rather than "FB"). The *wang series is perhaps connected with Tibetan 'a-bang FSiH,MSiH (literary), Limbu (am-)pang-a "uncle", Vayu pong-pong < *pang-pang FB.

Tibetan sru MSi has been compared with Kanauri and Chamba Lahuli ru Fl, Pyu sru "relatives", and the reconstructed

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Lolo root *ru MB. If these terms actually constitute a true series, we must reconstruct a root *sru ~ *ru "mother's relatives" (neuter), whence Kanauri ru F1 < MB through cross-cousin marriage, paralleling Kanauri o'ad S1 < S1S(ms). The presence of this root in Pyu, at approximately the year A.D. 1000, lends some weight to this view.

The fourth Tibetan PSb term, viz. ʾa-žang MB, is found in this form in Thebor and Lepcha, where it must be regarded as a loan-word, but not elsewhere. This form can be derived from an original *srang and thus compared with Mru ta-rang PSiH,HF, Kukish ta-rang ~ ma-rang, id., and probably Lhota o-nrã, Changki (Ao) (kŭ-)hram B1(ws). Burmese a-hrang < *srang (archaic spelling is a-hsyang) "lord, master" also perhaps belongs here rather than with sring-mo S1 (supra). The writer has long suspected that Tibetan initial ž- and š- have in many instances been derived from zr- and sr-, respectively, partly because of the general instability of those clusters in Tibetan (cf. srab-srib ~ hrab-hrib ~ rab-rib "dim, obscure"), and partly on the basis of comparative material, viz. Tib. šig "louse", Bunan šrig, Lushei hrik < *srik; Tib. žag "day (24 hours)", Burmese rak, id.; Tib. šags "joke, jest" (in sense of "ridicule"), Bunan šrag "shame", Burmese hrak < *srak "to be ashamed". The root *-rang (prefixed) must have had a generalized honorific force (still retained in Burmese), and thus was admirably suited as a periphrastic term either for MB or for PSiH,HF (= MB under cross-cousin marriage).

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Having completed our review of Tibeto-Burman kinship roots, we are now faced with the problem of fixing the basic pattern of nomenclature for this linguistic family. The terms designating relatives in the central line of descent naturally form the most stable segment of the nomenclature, while the collateral terms show an intermediate, and the affinal terms a maximum, amount of variation.

Within this stable core of nomenclature we are able to distinguish two primary gP terms (gM and gF), two primary P terms (M and F), a neuter ySb term, and a neuter Ch term. The two neuter terms are often employed in a masculine sense (yS and S), with sex affixes used in forming the corresponding feminine terms (ySi and D), e.g. Tibetan bu S, bu-mo D, Burmese sa^3 S, $sa-mi^3$ D. No neuter P terms have been uncovered, but Chang has a neuter gP term (a-pi < *p'i gM) used only in address, and a neuter gP term is also found in Sema (a-pu-sa), and in the Southern Kuki language Sho (a-pŏ) and Ayaing Khami (a-[illegible]). Three Southern Kuki languages (Chinbok, Yindu, Anu) make a distinction between FM and MM, but have a single term for gP (Anu FM < M, MM < gM). Four gP terms appear only in rare instances, and are never all primary. Both Tibetan and Kanauri show traces of three or four gP terms, but Kanauri has probably borrowed one or more of its gP terms from Tibetan, and the Tibetan material itself can be interpreted in more than one way. Kachin seems to employ four gP terms, perhaps because of Shan influence, but has only two primary terms (ji gF and woi gM). Garo distinguishes

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

between "gP" (= FF) and "gM" (= FM), and "my gP" (= MF) and "my gM" (= MM), if we can trust our sources for this language. In view of the fact that the Garo are a matrilineal group, this point is of some interest. Chang, which uses the neuter term a-pi gP in address, employs four terms in reference, the FF and FM terms being formed through affixed sex elements, and the MF and MM terms through analysis. Finally, Laiyo, which has an almost exclusively analytical nomenclature, employs four analytical gP terms.

A number of different arrangements of Sb terms have been encountered. Age distinctions appear everywhere and are, in general, more prominent than sex distinctions. Despite this, however, it would appear that the basic pattern has two primary terms for oB and oSi, contrasting with the single neuter ySb term (*nau). As has been shown above, the widespread tendency to equate oB and oSi with terms for relatives of ascending generations has obscured the general picture here and has made analysis almost impossible. The simplest possible arrangement (oSb and ySb) has been found only in Khami (Ayaing and Awa) and Anyo Rongma. A single primary term for oSb appears also in Kuki proper (u) and in Burmese (ato-), but Burmish-Lolo ish in general has two primary oSb terms. Nzong Rongma shows a complete reversal of the ordinary pattern, with terms for oSb, yB, and ySi. Tibetan, Lepcha, Dafla, Khoshin, Aka, Liyu, Chang, Chinbon, Ao and probably other less accurately recorded languages have what appears to be the basic arrangement, viz. oB, oSi, and ySb (three primary

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 terms). The Barish languages in general employ the root *nau ySb in the meaning "ySi" and have developed a new term for yB (perhaps connected with the Kachin term for B,ws), while Maithai reverses this process in employing *nau for "yB" and the Kukish root *dzar,Si(ms) for ySi. Simple terms for either B or Si are almost entirely lacking in Tibeto-Burman. Abor-Miri has terms for B and Si based on a root *buir (cf. a-buir "friend"), while in Dafla the cognate form *bör is used as the root for ySb, but note that Abor-Miri also possesses especial terms for oSb and ySb. Mikir hor Sb, like Abor-Miri buir, also has the more general meaning "friend".

Though the principle of age distinctions can be established as a basic feature of Tibeto-Burman kinship terminology, the status of sex-of-speaker distinctions is not so readily settled. We are handicapped here by the fact that most of our sources can not be depended upon in showing non-European distinctions of this type, and that negative evidence is therefore of little value. Distinct terms for Si(ms) and B(ws) are found in Tibetan, Kachin, Lushei and Lakher (and probably other Kuki languages), and Angami. Lushei and Lakher also have a distinct term (of periphrastic origin) for Si(ws). In Burmese and Nyi the distinction is applied only to ySb, viz. Burmese yB(ms), yB(ws),ySi(ws),ySi(ms), Nyi ySb(ms),yB(ws),ySi(ms), and Maru, in the same linguistic group, has a distinct term for yB(ws). Mikir distinguishes between oSi(ms) and oSi(ws), and has a distinct term for B(ws). Chinbok and Yindu, in the Southern

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Naik group, have a full set of eight Hb terms, showing complete distinctions both for age and for sex-of-speaker. The Chinbok system can be reduced to five primary terms, viz. pai oSi(ws), puo oS(ms), nau ySb(ms), be Si(ms), and bang B(ws), i.e. the Tibetan-Kachin arrangement. Sex of speaker appears not to be distinguished in Kanauri, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Barish, Meithei, and some other languages, but our sources, as mentioned above, are not of the most dependable sort. In view of the weight of evidence above, from such key languages as Tibetan, Kachin, Burmese, Mikir, and Lushei, the writer is inclined to regard the sex-of-speaker distinction as an archaic Tibeto-Burman feature.

Despite the fact that no single gCh root can with certainty be reconstructed for Tibeto-Burman, one can surely regard the presence of a primary gCh term as a basic feature for this linguistic family. Aside from the tendency to equate gCh with N or C (vide infra), it can be stated that most Tibeto-Burman languages have a distinct, usually primary, term for gCh, e.g. Kachin ˇsu, Burmese mrə³, Byangsi k'we, Kanauri o'ay, Lepcha a-som, Chang ˇsi, Garo and Mikir su, Meithei i-su. If a single gCh root must be predicated, TB *su must be regarded as the most likely selection. Equations of gCh other than with N are exceptional, but note Sema a-nu gCh= Ch(< TB *nau ySb).

The above discussion is resumed in the following diagram:

23:Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 ALL Southeast Asia ALL
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Tibeto-Burman Basic Pattern

gM (*p'i) gF (*p'u)

M (*ma) F (*p'a)

oS1(ms) oB(ms)

S1(ms) yBb (*nau) B(ws)

Ch (*ta)

gCh

It would be a rather hazardous undertaking to attempt any general explanation of the pattern outlined above in terms of sociological factors. A broad theory of this type must be based on a comprehensive comparative survey of Tibeto-Burman with a number of other groups, and as such lies outside the scope of the present study. Many of the variations from this pattern are undoubtedly significant, but they involve those elusive culture-linguistic intangibles which do not lend themselves to arm-chair analysis. It is only in the collateral and affinal nomenclatures that obvious cultural correlations are available, and it is these that the writer proposes to consider in some detail.

The distinction between cross (FS1 and MB) and parallel (FB and MS1) FSb terms is almost universal in Tibeto-Burman. No instances of an equation of FB with MB have been encountered, but FS1 and MS1 are equated in Bahing, Lepcha, and Chinbon, if we can trust our sources. Note that Lepcha also equates mC with pC, and that cross-cousin marriage is forbidden in this tribe.

SA 1001 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The parallel FB and MSi terms are usually either equated with the F and M terms (as in Chang, Lushei, Angami, Sema) or are based on these terms, with the addition of elements meaning "big" and "little" or the like. In other words, age distinctions are made in the parallel PSb terms precisely as in the Sb terms, though with categorical rather than primary elements. By way of contrast, the cross PSb terms seldom show these age distinctions, but note Burmese u^3-ri^3 MoB (cf. a-ri^3 FSi), u^3-$mang^3$ MyB, Chinbok pu-$\check{s}r\ddot{o}$ MoB (= gF), pu-ko MyB (these distinctions are typical of Southern Kuki in general). Some of the more characteristic examples of age distinctions in FB terms are listed below:

Language	FoB	FyB
Balti	a-ta ts'ar-ma	a-ta tsun-tso
Lepcha	a-bo-tim	a-bo-cum
Kachin	wa-di	wa-doi
Burmese	p'ă-kri^3	p'ă-t'we^3
Nyi	a-ba-gia	a-ba-[illegible]
Hakn	pa-u	pa-nau
Siyin	pa-lien	pa-no
Chinbon	pa k-dŏm	pa k-cwi
Tangkhul	a-va k'ă-răr	a-va ka-tui
Lhota	o-po-ra-mo	o-po-ro

One occasionally encounters what seem to be primary terms for FB or MSi, but most of these can be explained on the basis of ellipsis, e.g. Maru t'ong MyBi but mye-t'ang MySi,

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 ●197 p'a-t'ang FyB in the closely related Lashi language; Bodo a-yong FoB and a-doi FyB, but ma-gung MoSi and ma-doi MyBi; Mzong Rengma a-nyo FyB (nyo Ch), and perhaps Changki (Ao) a-sa FyB < *za Ch. Kanauri has a curious diminutive formation, viz. a-mats MBi < a-ma, and a-pats FB < a-pa. Tibetan and Nung, however, appear to have four true PSb terms. The Nung terms a-tsim MBi and a-wang FB have been compared with Tsangla a-zin MBi and Garo a-wang FyB, respectively. The Tibetan term sru MBi seems to have been derived from a root with the generalized meaning "mother's relatives", or "member of mother's clan, first ascending generation". Tibetan k'u FB, it can now be stated, has been developed from the TB root *k'u MB, and the Himalayish and Lepcha employment of this term in its Tibetan setting must be credited to Tibetan influence, which is conspicuous in both of these areas. Tibetan skud < *k'u Fl,Bl is to be explained in terms of xC marriage and the equation of WB with WF, as elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman. Tibetan 'a-ne FSi,MBW further fits into this picture. In Himalayish, Kanauri ru Fl < *sru MSb, and o'ed Bl < *ts'a SiS(me) suggest a like reconstruction. We have some material on xC marriage in the Tibetan area, but the term skud itself is, for the writer, the most significant single piece of evidence. Those who minimize the value of linguistic "fossils" in general might well take note of this term.

The semantic shift FB < MB in the Tibetan term k'u still requires explanation. Elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman the term has

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 been demoted to affinal rank or dropped altogether, but nowhere else has it been applied to FB. Now there is but one marital feature in which the Tibetan area (including the Kanauri group of Himalayish) significantly differs from the remaining Tibeto-Burman area, viz. polyandry. Fraternal polyandry of Tibetan type is practised by the Kanauri, almost certainly through Tibetan influence, since this custom is explicitly stated to be absent among the Almora peoples (Byangsi, Chaudangsi, Johar). Among the Lepcha polyandry is an abnormal trait and can unhesitatingly be assigned a Tibetan origin. Among other Tibeto-Burman group for which we have any record, polyandry either is said to be lacking or is simply not mentioned. Since Tibetan polyandry is of fraternal type, the importance of FB can readily be understood. It would seem that the MB term, which is unstable in most TB groups, was first replaced by the honorific term ʾa-tang and later applied to FB. The collective term skud-po F1,B1, having already been semantically specialized in an affinal sense, was naturally retained.

Primary cross FSb terms are basic TB features, and are represented by the roots *ni FSi and *k'u MB. The first of these two terms, however, is much more stable than the second, and significantly so (if statistically treated). Thus, Tibetan has transferred the MB term to FB and used an honorific for MB; Burmish-Loloish has retained the MB term only as an honorific applied to oB (in Burmese) or as an affinal term

SA (Ahi, Moso) and has developed new terms for MB (Burmese u^{3},
601 Lolo *ru); the Kuki languages proper have dropped the MB term
193 altogether and equated MB with gP; in the Naga group the MB
197 term has been preserved in its original setting only in Ao,
ST while in Rengma and Sema it has been retained only in the
601 affinal nomenclature. All of these groups, however, have the
193 root *ni FSi in its original setting. Burmese (but not
• 197 Burmish-Loloish) has replaced both the FSi and MB terms and dropped the former altogether, while Kachin has retained both terms only in its affinal nomenclature. The relatively greater stability of the FSi term is also evident in the borrowings made by various TB groups (infra).

This "differential variability" in the FSi and MB terms must be viewed in connection with the affinal application of these terms and the whole problem of cross-cousin marriage. Under bilateral xC marriage MB becomes Fl, and FSi becomes Ml, and it is not unlikely that honorific terms should become associated with these socially "pivotal" relationships. The fact that the MB=Fl term is more susceptible to this process than is the FSi=Ml term merely reflects the general patrilineal bias of Tibeto-Burman societies. The equation of MB with gP, which plays so prominent a role in Kukish, represents one aspect of this whole development, but teknonymy may also be a factor here ("Fl" designated as "gF of my son"). Teknonymy is hardly typical of Tibeto-Burman yet does occasionally occur. Lepcha, for example, employs a-bo F for Fl

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

where the couple are childless, but t'i-kung gF after the birth of a child, and the descriptive term a-fyat Fl has been derived from an original *sput, which in turn represents a morphological development from the TB root *p'u gF. Vayu ca-k'i Fl appears to be a combination of co < *ca Ch and ki-ki gF. Lahu, in the Southern Lolo group, has a-p'u gF = Fl, a-p'i gM = Ml, and Ahi, in the Northern Lolo group, has zu-p'o WF, also "paternal ancestor". The Chang Sbl terms are of teknonymous origin, e.g. hau-ko Bl(ms) = "his MB", but the Chang Fl terms are simply Fl = MB and Ml = FSi. Chinbon equates WF with gF, and WM with gM (rather than with MB and MBW, as in most Kuki languages), but retains the Kuki pattern in the HM and HF terms (HF = FSi, and especial term for HF), i.e. the teknonymous (or honorific) terms are employed only by the husband. The Mirish languages (Abor, Miri, Dafla) afford the best illustration of teknonymy. In Miri the terms a-bu and a-nĕ are used for F and M, respectively, but in the closely related Abor language these terms are applied to gF and gM, though ta-ta (Miri ta-to gF) is retained as the vocative term for gF. In this instance the child has taken over his parents' terms ("reverse teknonymy") rather than the parent his childrens' terms. Abor also uses the vocative gF term (ta-ta) for Fl, while Miri equates Fl either with gF or with MB, and Ml either with gM or with FSi (the equations with MB and FSi are probably only descriptive, though this is not stated in our sources). Dafla equates Ml with gM, probably also Fl with gF.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Under a system of bilateral xC marriage we should expect to find both WF and HF equated with MB, and both WM and HM equated with FSi. This condition is fulfilled in Byangsi and Abor-Miri, where this type of marriage is in vogue. The terminological equation also appears, however, in Nung, Chang, Sema, Nsong Rengma, and Lhota, for all of which preferential MBD marriage is indicated, and in Tangkhul and Angami, for which xC marriage cannot be established.

A system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD should lead to the equation of WF with MB, HM with FSi, and separate terms for HF and WM, as well as distinctions between FSiH and MB, MBW and FSi. Kachin fulfills all these conditions admirably, with unilateral xC marriage coupled with the terminological equations indicated above. The same can be said for the Kuki pattern, as illustrated in Lakher, Thado, Chawte, Tarau, as well as in Mru and Khami, viz. WF = MB, WM = MBW, HM = FSi, HF = FSiH. Unilateral MBD marriage is found among the Thado, Chiru, Anal, Aimol, Purum, and probably the Anal, She, and Khami. In Thado this nomenclature is employed only where MBD marriage has actually occurred, P terms being employed under other conditions.

Ntenyi and Anyo Rengma have an intermediate type, with M1 = FSi but WF = MB and a distinct term for HF, but in both languages the MB term is sometimes applied to HF as well as to WF. The closely related Nsong Rengma has a single term for F1 (WF, HF = MB), but retains a distinct term for FSiH. Sema has the same scheme as Nsong Rengma. The Sema term for FSiH,

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 ●197

furthermore, is cognate with the Ntenyi and Anyo Rengma term for HF, and in Ao the same term appears in its original setting (MB). This Naga material thus shows various stages of the transformation of the affinal terminology through the development of unilateral xC marriage. The discrepancies found in Nung, Chang, and Lhota are perhaps more apparent than real, and in the case of Nung and Lhota, at any rate, our sources may be faulty. Even in these affinal features, however, we must expect to find a certain amount of disassociation, for we must allow for linguistic "lag", i.e. the simple scheme of equating F1 with MB and M1 with FSi tends to be perpetuated even where the development of a unilateral "skew" has rendered it theoretically illogical. This general point has been raised many times before, but will bear repetition in view of the fact that a number of modern theoreticians seem to object to this sort of reasoning.

It is fairly evident that the abandonment of xC marriage as an institutionalized norm has in several different groups resulted in the disappearance of categorical equations. In Tibetan and Kanauri we have only the "fossilized" terms skud-po and ru, respectively, which require comparative studies for a full appraisal of their significance. In Lahul, however, where we have a hint of xC marriage, the equations F1= MB and M1= FSi are in evidence. In Burmese itself categorical equations are lacking, and here also we have no evidence of xC marriage, but the situation is reversed in Arakanese (Chaungtha).

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 ●197

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, equate M1 with FSi, WF with MB, and have a distinct term for FSiH, HF (as in Maeng and Anyo Rengma). Kachin influence perhaps plays a role here, yet the Kachin distinguish between WM and HM, as is consistent with their unilateral xC marriage practice. Nyi, in the Northern Lolo group, has derived its terms for WF and WM from the terms for MB and FSi, respectively, plus the element mo "old", acting here as an honorific, while the Burmish-Loloish affinal root *yok is employed in the terms for HM and HF. Ahi seems to reverse this scheme, to judge from our faulty data on this language. For Lisu we have only what appear to be the vocative terms for F1 and M1 (ma-ma < a-ma M, ba-ba < a-ba F), and hence are not in a position to interpret this Lolo material. The use of respectful designations may be a complicating factor here; cf. Lushei pu-zon WF, pi-zon WM, conforming to the Kuki pattern (from pu MB and pi MBW plus an added element -zon), but pa HF (= F) and nu HM (= M), i.e. a woman equates her husband's relatives with her own blood kin.

Categorical equations in the F1 terms are present elsewhere, but our sources are often incomplete. Garo equates M1 with FSi, MBW, but has a distinct term for F1 (a-bu-di, perhaps "little gF"). Mikir equates WF with MB, WM with FSi (with or without the addition of an honorific suffix), and has a distinct term for HF. If we assume that HM (not given in our sources) is also equated with FSi, this system can be compared with that found in Rengma and Maru. Both Garo and Mikir have

SA 601 193 197 preferential MBD marriage. Meithei equates Ml with FSi, and has i-ku Fl < TB *k'u MB (the MB term is not known for sure, but may be the Indic loan-word māmā); the Meithei are not known to practice xC marriage.

ST 601 193 197 The rest of the collateral terminology (C and N terms) is even more poorly known than the PSb terminology, and presents even more serious problems. In view of the presence of basic TB roots for MB (*k'u) and FSi (*ni) one might expect to find one or more roots for xC, but such is hardly the case. The extension of Sb terms to include pC is practically universal and need not be examined in detail. The lack of especial xC terms is probably associated with the lack of xC marriage, but there are too many lacunae in our data to permit of any final judgment here. Tibetan apparently fails to distinguish between pC and xC, but Burmese perhaps has a distinct xC term (sa-mi^{3}-mrok-sa^{3}, lit. "D's spouse"!). By way of contrast, Chaungtha, one of the Arakanese dialects, has yauk-pa Bl,xC corresponding to Burmese yok-p'a$^{\cdot}$ Bl(ms), in conformity with its equation of Fl with MB and Ml with FSi, i.e. an affinal term has "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature.

Terms for xCe and xCi in conjunction with xC marriage are found in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, Lisu, and Chang, while Dafla has this terminological pattern but without data on xC marriage. Chang appears to have preferential MBD marriage, but the bilateral type is found among the others.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 Byangsi-Chaudangsi makes a sex-of-speaker distinction, viz. xCi(ms), xCe(ws), xC(ss), and Abor-Miri makes an age distinction. None of the terms involved is associated with a PSb term or a N term. The Abor-Miri terms show "invasion" from the affinal terminology, as in Chaungtha, e.g. mag-bo xCe(os) = oBl,Sl, from TB *mak Sl. Note that in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, and Chang this xC pattern is associated with the simple Pl = PSb categorical equations (for Lisu we lack full information on the Pl terms).

Cross-cousin terminologies of Omaha type are found in two primary foci, viz. Kachin and Kukish. The correlation between the Omaha nomenclature and patrilineal descent, one of the few widely accepted anthropological generalizations, obtains both among the Kachin and the various Kuki and Naga tribes. Of the Tibeto-Burman peoples only the Garo and Khasha, in the Barish group, are known to have matrilineal descent, and unfortunately we know nothing of the cousin terminology in use among these tribes. There is a hint of the Crow type of terminology in Bodo, also in the Barish group, but we cannot be sure that the Bodo reckon descent in the matrilineal line. Bodo (nang-)a-doi "(thy) oBCh", (a-)doi FyB show reciprocity, as has already been pointed out, but Bodo nam-ba-noi "(thy) SiS", (nang-)a-noi "(thy) SiD", and a-noi FSi cannot be explained on this basis and suggest rather the Crow pattern. It is greatly to be regretted that our Garo sources fail us at this critical point.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The Kachin system, which is quite distinct from that found in Kukish, merits especial examination. The key terms are as follows:

Kachin Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

moi	FSi	ts'a	MB, MBS(ws)
ning	xCi(ws)	k'au	xCe(ms)
k'ri	FSiD(ms), SiCh(ms)		
rut	MBD(oms)		
nam	MBD(yms), BCh(ws)		

(Affinal)

ni	WM, MBW, WBW	ku	HF, FSiH, HoB, oSiH(ws)
moi	HM	ts'a	WF, BWB(ws)
ning	HSi, BW(ws)	k'au	WB, SiH(ms)
nam	Di, WySi, yBW(ms), WBCh	k'ri	Si, HSiCh, FSiHSi
rut	WoSi, ySiH(ws), oBW(ms), HyB		

The main features of this system have already been discussed in pt. 7. It will be observed that the lineal equations characteristic of the Omaha pattern appear only in the terms for non-marriageable cross-cousins under the Kachin unilateral xC marriage arrangement, i.e. a man equates his (non-marriageable) FSiD with his SiCh, while a woman equates her (non-marriageable) MBS with her MB. The terms applied by a woman to her (marriageable) FSiS are not known, but a man equates his (marriageable) MBD with his WSi. Distinct terms are used by speakers of each sex for xC(ss).

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

On the basis of comparative material, the terms nam and k'ri must be regarded as originally affinal (D1 and S1, respectively). Both terms have "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature via the categorical equations D1=HD(ws) and S1=SiS(ms), as are consistent with the practice of MBD marriage. Note that both terms have become neuter in the course of this transformation. We must next enquire of the fate of the original xW terms thus displaced. The terms moi FSi and ts'a MB can be called upon at this point. We lack comparative material on moi, but Tibetan has ts'a SiS(ms) corresponding to the Kachin term, and we can therefore interpret Kachin ts'a MB as a product of reciprocal usage. We have conclusive support for this view in the term k'ri HSiCh,FSiHSi, which at first puzzled the writer. Under the Kachin tripartite organization, as described by Gilhodes, FSiHSi becomes MBW, and MBW ~ HSiCh are reciprocal terms. Since moi FSi closely parallels ts'a MB, we are justified in interpreting this term analogically as a reciprocal development from HD(ws).

To continue our analysis, moi and ts'a have displaced the original cross FSb terms ni and ku, which are retained in the affinal nomenclature. An original system of bilateral xC marriage must be postulated to account for ni WW,MBW < FSi, and ku HF,FSiH < MB. The categorical equations shown by ning xCi(ws)=Sil(ws) and k'au xCe(ms)=Bl(ms) also call for this type of marriage.

To complete our reconstruction, the terms ning, k'au, and rat must be regarded as originally consanguineal rather

SA them affinal. We have comparative material only for ning,
601 which is represented by Chang (Konyak) nyăng < ᵊning xC,
193 Mikir neng < ᵊning BW(ws). We must further reconstruct rat
197 as the term for xC(ds), i.e. the marriageable xC under the
ST original bilateral xC marriage arrangement. This yields the
601 theoretical categorical equations xCi(ms) = Sil(ms) and xCe(ws) =
193 Bl(ws). Under the conventional type of levirate, which is
197 found among the Kachin, a distinction must be made between the (marriageable) oBW and the (non-marriageable) yBW. In Kachin this distinction is made, in the case of a man, by equating yBW with Dl (nam) and in retaining the term rat for oBW, and, in the case of a woman, by equating HoB with HF (ka) and in retaining the term rat for HyB. Since a man marries his MBD, the distinction between rat MBD(oms) and nam MBD(yms) is the natural result of that described above. It is a fair inference that the missing terms for FSiS(ws) are ka FSiS(ows) and rat FSiS(yws). Note that the equation of MBD(yms) with BCh(ws) is a by-product, so to speak, and is not to be taken as a 'Crow' feature.

We are now in a position to evaluate the Omaha features of the Kachin system. It has been demonstrated that the Kachin have developed a unilateral xC marriage system from an original bilateral arrangement, and that this shift has produced a profound transformation in the kinship terminology. The equating of MBS(ws) with MB, and of FSiD(ms) with SiCh(ms) serves to distinguish the non-marriageable from the marriageable

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

cross-cousins. These equations closely parallel those already noted in the Sbl terminology, and appear to form part of the same pattern. If this inference be correct, we must regard the institution of the levirate as a contributing factor here.

The Kachin terminology under the original bilateral xC marriage system can be reconstructed as follows:

Reconstructed Kachin System

(Consanguineal)

ni FSi	ku MB
ning xCi(ws)	k'au xCe(ms)
ret xC(ds)	
moi BD(ws)	ta'a SiS(ms)

(Affinal)

ni MBW,Ml	ku FSiH,Fl
ning Sil(ss)	k'au Bl(ss)
ret Sbl(ds)	
nam Dl	k'ri Sl

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, show Omaha features of Kachin type, e.g. Lashi so-ok FSiD(ms), SiCh(ms) and zo-auk Sl (a variant of so-ok), directly comparable with the Kachin term k'ri. Our material here is too uncertain to justify any further investigation of this point, and we have no data on the Maru and Lashi marriage practices. Both tribes are closely identified with the Kachin, and have even incorporated Kachin loan-words into their kinship nomenclatures, so that direct Kachin influence must be reckoned with in this

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

matter. To judge from what little we know of the collateral terms of other Burmish-Loloish languages, Omaha features are not present. There is some evidence suggesting that the root *tu is applied both to N and C in Lisu and in Ulu (Northern Lolo), but the Lisu material is inconsistent and the Ulu material is not precise

The Omaha nomenclatures found among the Kukish tribes are quite distinct in type from the Kachin nomenclature. The Kuki tribes proper, including Southern Kuki and Tangkhul, employ the following basic scheme (in many varieties):

Kuki Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

pi gM,MBD — pu gF,MB,MBS

ni FSi

tu FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh

(Affinal)

pi MBW,WM,WSi — pu WF,WB

ni HM — -rang FSiH,HF

mou DI,BW(ws) — mak SI,SiH(ws)

Lushei has an especial term for BCh(ws), viz. va' (apparently connected with the root *wa H), and Yindu has an especial term for BD(ws), viz. (ka-)li, which has been compared with the root *ma-li gCh (Burmese, Nung), xN (Jingpho). In Siyin and Chawte, however, BCh(ws) is equated with Ch. The analyzing development in Laiyo has entirely obliterated all traces of the Omaha system, yet the term tu FSiCh is

SA retained. Haka has both (k-)tu FSiCh and the analytical term
601 (k-)ni fa as an alternative. Lakher applies Sb terms (in
193 address) to FSiCh and occasionally to MBCh, and both Thado
197 and Aimol sometimes apply the oSb term to FSiCh(os). Chinbok
ST employs an analytical term for MBS, but equates MBD with MySi.
601 Thado resembles Chinbok in equating MBD with MSi, but elsewhere
193 the regular equation is with MBW = gM. Chinbok is further
● 197 aberrant in equating FSiS with SiS(ms) but having a distinct
term for gS. Yindu equates DS with SiS, FSiS, but employs an
analytical term for SS. Yindu has distinct terms for MBCh,
and Kyaw has distinct terms both for MBCh and FSiCh(i.e.
Omaha features are lacking). Aimol, if we can trust our
sources, has reversed the Kuki pattern, with (ka-)pu FSiS
and (ka-)tu-pa MBS. Chinbon has MoBS = MyB, MyBS = WB, reflecting the stress placed on age distinctions in Southern Kuki.
Our Chawte material, which is not reliable, indicates a
distinction between FSiS(ws) and FSiD(ms), and the equation
of SiCh(mws) with gCh. The affinal term mak Sl is commonly
replaced by the consanguineal term tu SiS(ms), as in Haka,
Chawte, and Sho, and the reverse process whereby an affinal
term "invades" the consanguineal nomenclature (as in Kachin)
is illustrated by Kyaw sa-mak SiCh(ms) = Sl, and Ayaing Khami
mok-sa FSiCh, SiCh(ms) = Sl, both from the root *mak Sl. The
latter language has retained the root *tu, however, in the
term (ka-)tu FSiCh(ws), gS.

It is evident from the above citations that this Omaha
pattern is extremely susceptible to variation at all points.

SA Nothing approaching the specific Kachin variety has been
601 encountered, however, and the two systems seem to have little
193 in common. In the Kuki system the equations FSiCh=SiCh(ms)
197 and MBS=MB obtain regardless of the sex or speaker, there are
ST additional equations of MB with gF and SiCh(ms) with gCh,
601 and ni FSi is retained as a consanguineal term. In addition,
193 distinct terms for xCh(ss) and Sbl are lacking. The historical
197 developments of the two systems have been quite different, if
we are permitted to draw inferences from comparative data.
The terms pi and pu are the original gP terms (TB *p'i gM,
*p'u gF), and the term -rang (prefixed) can be regarded as the
original term for MB, cognate with Tibetan ʾa-žang < *zrang MB
(cf. Kachin ku HF,FSiH=MB). The term tu occasions some
difficulty, since we have only the Burmish-Loloish root *tu
and the Nung term pa-du, both applied to H (xM in Burmese)
for comparison. In view of the parallelism in the equations
MB=gF and xM=gCh, however, we must fix the original meaning
of tu as "gCh" rather than "xM". The clue to these equations
seems to be teknonymy in conjunction with xC marriage, i.e.
we must suppose that a man applied the teknonymous terms pu
gF and pi gM to his wife's parents, whereas a woman applied
the consanguineal terms ni FSi and -rang MB. With the develop-
ment of unilateral marriage with MBD, a feature found in the
Kuki area as well as in Kachin, the two sets of Fl terms were
fully differentiated in function, and the term pu Fl=gF
replaced the consanguineal term -rang MB, with pi coming into

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 use for MBW. The equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh was the natural result of the above development. Since the term ni FSi was retained in its original setting, no comparable term was developed for the reciprocal relationship BCh(ws). The evidence for the use of teknonymous terms in Tibeto-Burman in general has been resumed above and need not be discussed at this point. Within the Kuki group, note Chinbon (ka-)mo-pauk WH=gF and (ka-)mu-bok MoB (probably a variant of the foregoing), (ka-)mo WM=gM and (ka-)mok MoBW (probably a variant of the foregoing), but (ka-)se HF (analysis uncertain), (ka-)si HM=FSi. Chinbon thus makes use of teknonymous terms precisely as suggested above for the Kuki group in general.

We are still faced with the problem of explaining the equations MBS=MB, MBD=MBW (or MSi), and FSiCh=SiCh(ms). Here again we must take into account the affinal setting of these terms under a system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD. The fundamental equation seems to have been that between WF and WB (pu) rather than between MB and MBS, i.e. these kin were identified because of the similarity of their roles as wife's father and brother rather than as mother's brother and mother's brother's son. In other terms, the especial position of MB and MBS among the Kuki groups seems in large measure to have arisen through xC marriage. The equation of FSiCh with SiCh(ms) reflects the equation of MBS with MB, just as the equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh reflects the equation of MB with gF.

It is possible to conceive of the Kuki development without recourse to teknonymy simply by assuming that pu gF was

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 applied to MB and MBS in an honorific sense, with tu gCh SiCh(ms)=FSiCh as a complementary equation. In any event, the equation in the MB line must be regarded as the primary one, and the equation in the FSi line as complementary. The same situation was found to obtain among the Kachin (supra).

The Naga languages, which make up the northern division of the Kukish group, also reveal Omaha features, which are of Kuki rather than Kachin type. MBD is equated with MSi or MySi rather than with gM=MBW. In Ao (all three dialects) the terms for gF (o-pu) and gCh (sam-cir) are distinct, i.e. there is no teknonymy, the TB root *k'u is retained in the consanguineal nomenclature (o-k'u MB,MBS) while MBD is equated with MySi, and the affinal terms for Sl (a-nok) and Dl (a-mu) are applied to FSiS,SiS(ms) and FSiD,SiD(ms), respectively, precisely as in Ayaing Khami. Sema has a distinct term for gF (neuter) and equates gCh with Ch, but has developed a new root for MB,MBS (a-ngu) and has retained the root *k'u only in the affinal meaning "FSiH" (a-ci). Thus both Ao and Sema show full Omaha features without distinction of sex of speaker (as in Kuki) but also without teknonymy (as in Kachin). The Angami, Rengma, and Lhota systems, however, all show teknonymous features. Rengma (all three dialects) equates MB,MBS(os) with gF (ggF in Nzong), and FSiCh,SiCh(ms) with gCh. Lhota shows a partial equation of MB,MBS with gF (o-mo and o-mo-tsŭ) and at least similar terms for FSiS,SiS(ms) and gS (o-hro and o-hre). Angami equates FSiS,ySiS(ms) with gS, but distinguishes between

SA gF and MB, yet the term for the latter (mi) is connected with
601 the Rengma term for gF,MB (a-mi ~ a-mui) and the Lhota term
193 for MB (o-mo) and gF (o-mo-tsü). We can thus interpret Angami
197 mi MB as the original term for gF,MB and in this way explain
ST the lack of symmetry in the Angami nomenclature as it now
601 stands (a man calls his sister's child "gCh", but a child
193 calls his mother's brother "uncle"). Angami lacks the Omaha
● 197 traits on one side, since MBCh is addressed or described by
name, or analytically if the need arises. The Rengma equations on the MB side appear only in the vocative nomenclature, and only when the cousin (MBS or MBD) addressed is older than speaker.

As noted in pt. 16, Majumder attempted to explain some of the features of the Sema nomenclature in terms of marriage with F's widow, after the fashion instituted by Rivers. Almost no instances of marriages of this type have been encountered in the Tibeto-Burman area, however, and the writer fails to see how Rivers' theories are of any relevancy in the present situation. The most curious form of marriage noted is the Lisu marriage with FSi cited by Fraser, and this is not reflected in the Lisu nomenclature. Omaha features among the Omaha and Miwok are perhaps based on WBD marriage, but for the American evidence there is no unanimity of opinion, and at least three recent writers on the subject (White, Gifford, Tax) have attacked this as a general explanation. Of this trio White alone suggests a general explanation, viz. that the Omaha type

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 is developed from the Dakota-Iroquois type (pC=Sb, xC distinct term) under the influence of a mature and vigorous patrilineal clan system. Gifford has successfully attacked this view on the basis of the American material, and the same general strictures are applicable in the Tibeto-Burman field, where no correlation can be established between strong patrilineal clans and the Omaha type of terminology.

The Kuki equation of xN with gCh is also encountered in Miri (ā < o-i "child below") and Tibetan (ts'a). Miri has retained the TB root *k'u MB (a-kū), but does apply teknonymous terms to F1 and M1 (= MB and FSi under the Miri bilateral xC marriage system). In Tibetan, however, teknonymy has been found only in the dialect of Bathang (eastern Tibet) as recorded by Desgodins, who cites rmo-rmo M1 = MM (hence a man's term for his WM). Abor shows reverse teknonymy in the shifts a-bu gF < F and a-nă gM < M, reflected in the equation o Ch = N = gCh (Abor, like Miri, applies teknonymous terms to F1 and M1).

SA 601 ST 601 We are perhaps not justified in concluding that all equations of xN with gCh are based on teknonymy involving the affinal nomenclature (gF > F1 = MB), but no better general explanation can be suggested. The general thesis outlined above conforms to the basic Tibeto-Burman sociological pattern of cross-cousin marriage, and thus enjoys an initial advantage over any alternative theories of a more ad hoc nature.

Reciprocal terminology has already been mentioned in connection with Kachin ts'a MB < SiCh(ms), k'ri MBiCh, FSiMBi,

SA 601 ST 601 some tribes of the Nama marriage with MBD "is said to have been far more common" (p. 244). For the replacement of the MB term by the Dutch loan-word (omob < oom), cf. the widespread Tibeto-Burman borrowing of the Indic term māmā MB (infra).

The BaThonga evidence (Junod, pp. 216 and ff.) is complicated by the existence of dialectical differences. The regular MB term is malume (Zulu malume MB), applied also to MBS. The Northern BaThonga, however, have kokwana gF,MB,MBS, ntukulu SiS(ms),gS. The BaRonga clans are in a neatly transitional stage, with alternative sets of terms. Radcliffe-Brown (1924) has made an illuminating analysis of the BaThonga material, in which the significance of the terms malume ("male mother") and rarana ("female father") is pointed out (cf. also Firth's discussion of the FSi as "male father" in Tikopia). The BaThonga do not practice xC marriage, according to Junod, and the parallelism with Kuki thus breaks down at this point. Since the application of kokwana gF to MB is apparently of late origin here, the teknonymy principle is of no avail in this instance, and we must accept Radcliffe-Brown's mode of reasoning. Note that neither the Nama nor the BaThonga system is of true Omaha type.

****

SA 197 601 ST 197 601 Loan-words appear in many of the Tibeto-Burman kinship terminologies, and include terms of Indic, Chinese, and Shan origin, as well as of Tibeto-Burman origin. Indic loan-words are found in a string of languages extending from Baltistan

SA
197
601
ST
197
601

and Kanawur in the northwest to the Garo Hills in the southeast, all exposed to direct Indian influence. The extent of borrowing in kinship nomenclature is in general correlated with the rate of borrowing in general, but this is not necessarily so, e.g. Magari has preserved a large proportion of its original TB vocabulary yet has retained only a single kinship term (za Ch), if we can trust our sources. The tendency to borrow terms for male kin rather than female kin has been observed in Balti, Kanauri, Newari (less well marked), Miri, and Barish. Terms for relatives older than speaker are also more likely to be borrowed than those for relatives younger than speaker. Probably both points can be explained on the basis of the honorific connotations associated with loan-words in general, which go to make up the "respectable" idiom as opposed to the vulgar. The term mama MB has been borrowed by Balti, Kanauri, Dhimal, Bodo, Garo, and perhaps Meithei, whereas the Indic FSi term has been borrowed only once (Dhimal).

The most prominent instances of borrowings made within Tibeto-Burman are those of Lepcha from Tibetan, and Atsi from Kachin. To illustrate the vagaries in the borrowing process, Atsi borrows its MB and FSi terms from Kachin but retains its native FB and MSi terms, whereas Byangsi (Almora group) borrows from Indic (Khasiya) its terms for FoB and FyB but employs a native term for MB. The borrowing of a term in a specialized sense only is exemplified by the following curious series: Kanauri mak-pa "Sl living in Fl's house" (from Tibetan); Lepcha ku-mok, id. (from Tibetan); Kachin

SA 197 601 ST 197 601 luk-k'i, id. (from Shan). All three languages have distinct Sl terms applied under normal conditions. Contrast Garo nok-rong "Sl living in Fl's house" (native term), cowari "Sl other than above" (from Indic); note that among the Garo the nok-rong is a formalised institution in a matrilineal society. It would be difficult to find a more ideal illustration of the mirroring of sociological features in linguistic phenomena.

Bibliography [1]

SA 113 ST 113

Bose, J. K.

1934. Dual Organisation in Assam. UCJDL 25, no. 8.

1937. Origin of Tri-clan and Marriage-classes in Assam. Man 37, Correspondence, 110.

Das, T. C.

1935. Kinship and Social Organization of the Purum Kukis of Manipur. UCJDL 28, no. 6.

Firth, R.

1930. Marriage and the Classificatory System of Relationship. JRAI LX. 235-68.

Gifford, E. W.

1940. A Problem in Kinship Terminology. AA 42. 190-94.

Hodson, T. C.

1925. Notes on the Marriage of Cousins in India. MI 5, nos. 3 and 4.

Hutchinson, R. H. S.

1906. An Account of the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Calcutta.

1 [For abbreviations see this source in Cat. 113, ALI Southeast Asia ALI -- Analyst]

23:Benedict E-5 (no date)1941 ALl Southeast Asia
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3
Karen AP7

SECTION B

KAREN AND CHINESE

1. Introduction

ST
197
[121]
K
197
[121]

Having completed a review of the Tibeto-Burman kinship terminologies, the writer now proposes to discuss in summary fashion the salient points of the Karen and Chinese nomenclatures. Karen and Tibeto-Burman together constitute the western branch of the Sino-Tibetan stock, the eastern branch of which is represented by Chinese (Sinitic) and the Sinitic element in Thai. The term "Indo-Chinese" has been employed in a somewhat broader sense to include Thai itself, and the latter family is commonly coupled with Chinese in contrast to Tibeto-Burman. This view has been developed in a masterly study by Wulff and is shared by Maspero, a pioneer in Thai linguistics. The writer himself was originally partial toward this view, but more intensive investigations of the Thai languages have led to the conviction that a wholly distinct substratum is involved here, and that the Sinitic elements constitute little more than a veneer, albeit an ancient one. A rapprochement with Indonesian has been initiated, largely on the basis of a newly discovered linguistic group in southern China, northern Tonkin, and the island of Hainan. This newly recognized group, consisting of Kelao (southern China), Laqua (northern Tonkin), and Dai or Loi (Hainan), has been named "Kadai". Kadai is notable for its retention

ST 197 K 197

of a numeral system based on Indonesian roots in connection with numerous Thai features, and serves to explain certain resemblances between Thai and Indonesian.

The connection between Tibeto-Burman and Chinese, long a favorite theme with philological speculators, can now be regarded as established (Simon, Shafer, Benedict). The relationship is an ancient one, however, comparable with that between Indo-European and Hittite or between Semitic and Hamitic, and generalizations covering the phonological relations of the two families can be drawn only with the utmost difficulty. Karen stands in an altogether different type of relationship with Tibeto-Burman, and these two families must be derived from a common origin (Tibeto-Karen) as opposed to Chinese (vide the discussion in pt. 2). The following set of roots illustrates the lexical affinities of Chinese with Tibeto-Burman and Karen; forms are cited for Ancient Chinese (6th century), Archaic TB (as reconstructed by the writer), and five Karen dialects.

	Chinese	TB	Taungthu	Zayein	Sgaw	Pwo	Mopgha
five	nguo (五)	*l-nga *b-nga	ngat	ngä nyä	yä	yai	zä
I	nguo (吾)	*nga	-	nga nya	ya	ya	za
fish	ngiwo (魚)	*ngya	-	-	nya	ya	-
plantain	-	*ngak	nga	-	ya	ya	za

Note Sgaw y- < ng- but ny- < ngy-, and cf. Tib. nga < *nga "I" but nya < *ngya "fish". The root for "plantain" illustrates the type of "partial equation" between Tibeto-Burman and Karen

ST 197 which is frequently encountered (in this instance the root is perhaps an old loan-word in Karen).

K 197 The relationships among Tibeto-Burman, Karen, Chinese, and Thai can conveniently be diagrammed as follows:

Sh 197 60 In view of the peculiar linguistic position occupied by Thai, the kinship terminologies of the several Thai languages have been omitted from consideration in the present study. The writer has examined the kinship terms used in Siamese, Lao, Shan, Khamti, Ahom, Black Tai, Tho, Nung, and Dioi, however, and is thus able to make a few general observations. The Thai system is remarkable for its uniformity from group to group, though it must be remembered that the Thai languages in general are fairly uniform. Age distinctions are even more prominent than in Tibeto-Burman, and appear both in the Sb and PSb terms (*bi oSb, *nong ySb; *lung FoB,MoB, *pa MoSi,FoSi). The collateral lines tend to be merged in the PSb terminology, as in Lowie's "lineal" type, yet the Sb terms are extended to include both pC and xC, e.g. Siamese nong is defined as "kindred of a younger branch, younger brother or sister, cousins, spouse, mistress" (in the standard Siamese lexicon by Pallegoix). Four gP terms are found in some Thai languages though not in all and undoubtedly must be regarded as forming part of the basic pattern, e.g.